

A
DISSERTATION
Biblia ON THE *Gal. 1. 1. 6. 10.*
CHRONOLOGY
OF THE
K SEPTUAGINT.

WITH AN
APPENDIX.

SHEWING,

That the CHALDEAN and EGYPTIAN
ANTIQUITIES, hitherto esteem'd FABULOUS,
are perfectly consistent with the *Computations*
of that most Ancient Version of the HOLY
SCRIPTURES.

By the AUTHOR of *The Vindication of the
History of the SEPTUAGINT, and the
Critical Examination of St. Matthew and
St. Luke's Gospels.*

Magna est Veritas & prævalebit.

LONDON:

Printed for T. WOODWARD, at the *Half-Moon*, between
the *Temple-Gates, Fleet-Street.*

M DCC XLI.

6



T H E

P R E F A C E.

AFTER all the learned Dissertations and Discourses that have been published by some of the greatest and most eminent of our modern Writers both for and against the Chronology of the Septuagint, it is very natural to imagine that nothing new or very material can now be offered upon the same Subject either Way.

Now as it would but ill become a Party so deeply interested in the Cause, to contradict a Notion which seems to be so well grounded; all that I have to do here, is only to give the Reader a short Account of the following Essay, and to submit it entirely to him to determine, whether I have offered any Thing new and material upon the Subject or not.

There is a very wide Difference between the Computations of the Hebrew Text, and those of the Septuagint for the two first Ages of the World; that is, from the Creation to the Flood, and from thence to the Birth of Abraham. And the great Question is, To which of them,

iv The P R E F A C E.

in Point of Chronology, we ought to give the Preference?

To say, as some do, that the Scriptures were wrote at first in Hebrew, and that therefore we ought to prefer the Computations of the Original to those of any Version, is a short Answer indeed; but, in my Opinion, very little to the Purpose; unless it could be proved that the Hebrew Scriptures contain a full and compleat System of Chronology from the Creation to the Time in which the last of the sacred Writers lived and wrote.

To say with others, that the Version of the Septuagint was made from more correct Copies of the Hebrew Scriptures than any of those which have been in Use among the Jews ever since; or that the Jews have wilfully corrupted their Copies, either before or soon after the Times of Christianity; and consequently that the Computations of the Septuagint ought to be preferred to those of the present Hebrew Text; I say, to sit down content with such Assertions, would be as short and easy a Way to end the Controversy on the other Hand; if Assertions, only, without full and clear Proof, were of any Weight in a Point of this Importance.

To say that the Jews have never at any Time designedly altered or corrupted any of the

The P R E F A C E. v

the original Numbers in the Hebrew Text ; and at the same Time to maintain that the Numbers which we have now in the Septuagint, are the self-same Numbers which those Interpreters inserted into their Version, will, I fear, at first Sight be thought a very bold and ill-grounded Notion, if not a Sort of a Contradiction in Terms. And yet—shall I venture to say it—such is the Veneration due to both Texts ; and so unwilling am I to charge either of them with any wilful Corruptions or Interpolations, that I am strongly inclined to think that this is the true State of the Case between both.

It has been thought by many that the Holy Scriptures almost every where abound with mystical Numbers ; and it is well known that the ancient Jews maintained that, under the Veil and Cover of the Letter, the Writings of Moses contain many deep and hidden Mysteries relating to the Creation, the Fall, and the Restoration of all Things. Now, since no Man can be sure that this is not the Case ; who will take upon himself to say, that those Hebrew Numbers, which infinite Wisdom has thought fit to make use of in describing the Lives and Actions of the holy Patriarchs, are not the fittest, the most proper, and the most significant that

vi The P R E F A C E.

that could be chosen to shadow forth the sublime Truths, which lie concealed under them?

On the other Hand, who can tell but, besides the inspired Writings, which perhaps were never intended as a compleat Rule for Chronological Uses, the Jews might have many authentic Histories, Records, and Memoirs, which might give a more full and particular Account of all the great Transactions of ancient Times? Who can say that such Histories and Accounts did not agree in the Main with these of other Nations, and particularly with those of the Chaldeans and Egyptians, who possibly will be found not to have been such arrant Lyars and Forgers of Antiquities as many have vainly flattered themselves? And if so; when the Seventy Interpreters were to translate the Holy Scriptures out of Hebrew into Greek for the Benefit and Instruction of the Gentile World; who can tell but that they might change several of the Mystical Numbers in the Hebrew, and substitute others in their Room, less liable to Cavils, and at the same Time entirely agreeable to the well-known Histories of their own as well as of the other neighbouring Nations? And if they really did so; who can say that they had not sufficient Authority? who will take upon himself to blame them for so doing?

Upon

The P R E F A C E. vii

*Upon a general View, this seems to be the most rational Way of accounting for the present Differences between the Hebrew and the Greek Computations. But, if it can any Ways be made appear that the Jews actually had sundry other Histories, Records, and Memoirs of past Times, besides the Hebrew Scriptures; that their own Historian * made use of them in compiling his Antiquities, and that in Consequence thereof he agreed originally in all material Points with the Computations of the Septuagint: And if it should be likewise found upon Enquiry, that the best Accounts which we have now remaining of the Chaldean and Egyptian Antiquities, are also perfectly consistent with the Chronology of the Septuagint, and with that only; I say, if these two Points can be clearly made out to the Satisfaction of the Reader; it will then, I think, naturally follow, that the true Reason why the Computations in the Septuagint differ now from those in the Hebrew; is not because the one or the other has been corrupted, but because those Interpreters judged it more advise-*

* The same appears likewise clearly and incontestably from the Genealogies of our Blessed Saviour in St. Matthew and St. Luke; and more particularly from the latter, where the second Cainan is inserted by Name, as the Son of Arphaxad and Father of Salah. See the Genealogies of Jesus Christ, lately published by the Reverend and Learned Mr. Arch-Deacon Yardeley. Part III. § 1—7. pag. 246—276.

able

viii The P R E F A C E.

able in a Version intended for the Use of both Jews and Gentiles, to make Use of a System known and approved of by both, rather than to make use of the Hebrew Numbers, which none perhaps but the Μῦσαι* among the Jews themselves were at first permitted to peruse.

Now in order to get all the Light we can as to these Particulars, I have divided the following Dissertation into two Parts, and each Part into four Sections; and to the whole I have added an Appendix concerning the Chaldean and Egyptian Antiquities.

In the first Part, Sect. I. I have opened the State of the Controversy between Vossius

* One of the most learned of all the Fathers assures us, That this was the Practice not only among the Jews, but likewise among the Egyptians; and indeed among the wisest of all Nations in ancient Times. *Spiritibus enim spiritualia comparamus*, says he; propterea certe per modum occultationis eum, qui est vere divinus, & maxime nobis necessarius, in Adyto veritatis (ἐν τῷ Ἀδύτῳ τῆς ἀληθείας) repositum sermonem verè sacrum, Egyptii quidem per ea, quæ apud ipsos vocantur *Adyta* (διὰ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀδύτων καλεσµένων) Hebræi autem per *velum* (διὰ τοῦ παρακρυφισµοῦ) significarunt: quæ adire solis licebat iis, qui erant ex ipsis consecrati, hoc est, Deo dedicati, quibus erant circumcisæ vitiorum cupiditates per suam in solum Deum charitatem. *Non Mundo enim Mundum tangere*, Platoni quoque videbatur esse nefarium. The whole Passage, together with the most Reverend and Learned Editor's Notes upon it, is well worth the Reader's Perusal; for, I have only Room here to set down his Conclusion upon the whole, which runs thus: Omnes ergo, ut semel dicam, qui de rebus divinis tractarunt, tam Barbari quam Græci, rerum quidem principia (τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς τῶν πραγμάτων) occultaverunt: veritatem autem ænigmatibus, signisque ac symbolis, & Allegoriis rursus, & Metaphoris, & quibusdam talibus tropis modisque tradiderunt. *Clem. Alex. Strom. 5. pag. 237. Ed. Ox. 1715.*

and

The P R E F A C E. ix

and Pezron on one Side; and Martianay and Le Quien on the other.

In Sect. II. I have taken a View of the several Systems of Chronology, from the Creation to the Flood, according to the Hebrew, the Samaritan, the Septuagint, and Josephus; I have made such Remarks as I thought proper upon each; and upon the whole I have shewn, 1°. That it is uncertain whether the original Hebrew Text computed 1656, or 1556 Years from the Creation to the Flood; 2°. That it is likewise uncertain whether the Samaritan Pentateuch computed 1307, or 1556 Years to the same Period. 3°. That the true Length of this Period according to the Septuagint, is neither 2242 Years, as several of the Fathers thought; nor 2262 Years as others imagined; but 2256 Years. And 4°. That Josephus, who certainly had the Perusal of all the most authentic Histories and Records of the Jewish Nation then in being, as well as of the Holy Scriptures in Greek and Hebrew, reckoned likewise 2256 Years from the Creation to the Flood. And hence, I think, we may reasonably infer, that this Number of Years agreed exactly with all those Histories and Records of his own Nation, which he then had the Perusal of; for, otherwise it cannot be supposed that he would have pre-

b

ferred

x T H E P R E F A C E .

ferred the Number 2256, no where else to be found but in a Greek Version of the Scriptures, to that of 1556 or 1656 in the original Hebrew Text.

In Sect. III. I have taken a View of the same four Systems of Chronology from the Flood to the Birth of Abraham; I have made some short Remarks upon each of them, and upon the whole I have shewn, 1°. That according to the Hebrew, this Period amounts only to 292 Years; 2°. That according to the Samaritan it amounts to 942 Years; 3°. That according to the Septuagint it amounts to 1072 Years. And 4°. As to Josephus, I have shewn, that, exclusive of the second Cainan, he reckons 942 Years; which so far agrees exactly with the Samaritan Pentateuch; or, taking in the second Cainan, 1072 Years; which agrees exactly with the Septuagint. And as for the second Cainan, I have likewise shewn that it is much more probable that he has been either casually dropped, or designedly expunged, than that Josephus himself had him not originally in his Text. And upon the whole, I think, it cannot be supposed that the Samaritan as well as Josephus could have agreed so exactly and in so many Particulars with the Septuagint; if they had not known at the same Time, that they likewise
agreed

The P R E F A C E. xi

agreed with the then received Computations of the whole Nation of the Jews.

In Sect. IV. I have offered sundry Arguments to prove that the Chronology of the Septuagint for the two foregoing Periods, is preferable to that of our present Hebrew Copies. But here I must freely own, that when I wrote that Part, I had no Suspicion that the Jews had any other authentic Chronology or Histories, besides the Holy Scriptures; or that the Chronology, which they vulgarly reckoned by, might probably be the self-same with that which we have now in the LXX and in Josephus; And much less did I suspect that the Chaldeans and Egyptians had kept such exact Accounts of Time, as I have since found they did; or that their Accounts could be found to agree so nicely with those in Josephus and the LXX as they do. And therefore whatever I have said in this Section with Reference to the Corruption of the Hebrew Text, I hope the Reader will be so indulgent as to look upon it as said only hypothetically; and upon the vulgar Notion that the one Text or the other must have been corrupted: Which now, upon second Thoughts, I can by no Means agree to.

The Second Part consists likewise of four Sections: In the first, I have pointed out som

xii The P R E F A C E.

of Vossius and Pezron's Mistakes with regard to the Chronology of the two Periods above-mentioned. In the second, I have examined Dr. Wills's System, who pretends, that Josephus followed the Hebrew before the Flood; and the Septuagint after the Flood. In the third, I have made some Remarks upon Mr. Whiston's Hypothesis, who imagines, That the original Chronology of Josephus differed very much, both from the present Hebrew, and from the present Greek Chronologies; and that it very nearly agreed to that of the Samaritan Pentateuch. And, in the fourth, I have considered Mr. Des Vignoles's System, who contends, that Josephus neither followed the Sept. nor the Samaritan; but that before, as well as after the Flood, he always adhered to the Hebrew Text.

The APPENDIX is divided into two Sections. The first treats of the Chaldean Antiquities; and the second contains some Observations on those of the Egyptians.

In the first Section, I have examined Mr. Des Vignoles's Hypothesis, and also that of Mr. Fourmont, with regard to the true Meaning of the Chaldean Sosses, Neres and Sares; I have proposed some Conjectures of my own about them; I have enquired into the Nature of the first and most ancient Year made use

The P R E F A C E. xiii

use of by those two Nations; and, upon the whole, I have endeavoured to shew, 1°. That a Soss among the Chaldeans, was the 60th Part of a Day. 2°. That a Nere consisted of a System of 10 Days. 3°. That a Sare consisted of 222 or 223, or at most of $232\frac{1}{3}$ Lunations or lunar synodical Revolutions. 4°. That the first and most ancient Year which they made use of, was a lunar Year, consisting at a Medium of $29^d. 12^h. 44'. 3''. 10'''$. 30^{'''}. 5°. That the Year, which they afterwards constantly made use of in all their Computations, consisted of 365 Days, without any regard to the odd Hours, Minutes, &c. And, 6°. That in consequence of these Principles, the 120 Sares, which Berofus allotted to the Reigns of his ten antediluvian Kings, amounts to 2155 Years at least; or, at most to 2255 Years and some odd Months, which agrees, I may say, exactly with the Length of this Period, both in the Septuagint and in Josephus.

In the second Section, I have taken the old Egyptian Chronicle, still preserved in Syncellus; and by comparing the same with the Chronology of the Septuagint, and Josephus, I have shewn;

1. That by their twelve chief Gods, the Egyptians meant no more at first, but the 12 Patriarchs from Adam to Arphaxad: For the

Sep-

xiv The P R E F A C E.

Septuagint computes from the Creation to the Flood 2256 Years; and from thence to the Foundation of the Tower of Babel, when the Children of Men first revolted from Arphaxad their lawful Prince, 493 Years; in all 2749 Years: And according to the Egyptians, their 12 Gods reigned 33,984 Years or Lunations; and these reduced to Years of 365 Days, amounts exactly to the same Sum of 2749 Years, with the Addition only of some odd Months.

2. That the Egyptians reckoned the whole Number of Years that their Gods and Demigods or Heroes, reigned, that is, from the Creation to the Beginning of the Reign of Menes, to amount unto 36,525 Years or Lunations; that is to 2955 Egyptian Years of 365 Days each, and one Month.

3. That in the Reign of Menes, they left off computing by lunar Years, and ever afterwards reckoned by a Year of 365 Days.

4. That from the Beginning of the Reign of Menes, to the Beginning of the 16th Dynasty of Manetho, they reckoned 15 Generations and 443 Years.

5. That from the Beginning of the 16th to the End of the 30th Dynasty, about 15 Years before the Death of Philip the Father of Alexander the Great, they reckoned 98 Generations and 1755 Years.

6. That

The P R E F A C E. xv

6. *That the Sum of all these Years, from the Creation to the 15th Year before the Death of Philip, amounts unto 5153 Years.*

7. *That, according to the Septuagint, Josephus and Ptolemy's Chronological Canon, the Number of Years from the Creation to the same 15th Year of Philip, agrees exactly with this Egyptian Chronology; and are as follows;*

	Years. Totals.	
From the Creation to the Flood ———	2256	2256
The Flood to the Tower of <i>Babel</i>	493	2749
The Tower of <i>Babel</i> to the Birth of <i>Abraham</i>	579	3328
The Birth of <i>Abraham</i> to the Call ———	75	3403
The Call to the <i>Exodus</i> ———	430	3833
The <i>Exodus</i> to the Foundation of the Temple	592	4425
The Foundation to the Destruct. of the Temple	470	4895
The Destruction of the Temple to the first Year of <i>Cyrus</i> }	70	4965
The first of <i>Cyrus</i> to the second of <i>Darius</i> <i>Hystaspes</i> }	18	4983
The second Year of <i>Darius Hystaspes</i> to the 15 th Year before the Death of <i>Philip</i> }	170	5153

As for other Particulars, I must beg leave to refer the Reader to the Appendix itself; and to the Tables at the End of it: And shall therefore here take the Liberty to conclude this long Preface, with the following Queries.

1. *From all these Particulars, may we not reasonably conclude, that Josephus, Manetho and Berosus, and consequently that the most ancient Jews, Egyptians and Chaldeans, computed*

xvi The P R E F A C E.

ted the Years of the first Ages of the World by one and the same Chronology?

2. *May we not likewise fairly conclude, that the Chronology of all those Nations for the first Ages before and after the Flood, agreed in all Points with that of the Septuagint?*

3. *May we not also, with good Reason, conclude, that all those Nations must originally have acknowledged the 2^d Cainan, and the 130 Years allotted to him, as well as the seventy Interpreters? For, if they had not, how could their Computations have agreed so exactly as they do with those of the Septuagint?*

4. *From what has been here mentioned, is it not likewise manifest, that those Nations had as exact Methods, and were as careful in keeping an Account of Time, as the best and most accurate of our modern Chronologers? And if so; what are we to think of those Notions, which some have lately entertained, as if the Ancients had been extremely careless and negligent about their Antiquities; and that they had no other way of reckoning but in the gross by Ages or Generations?*

5. *From what has been said, does it not likewise evidently appear, that the Years in Scripture, before as well as after the Flood, and all along, are Years consisting of 365 Days, and neither more nor less? And if so, what*

The P R E F A C E. xvii

what are we to think of all those grave Historians, Chronologers and Divines, who would persuade us, that the Year before the Flood, and for many Ages after it, consisted only of 360 Days?

*6. If the mean Motions of the Moon have been precisely the same all along from the Creation to this very Day; may we not reasonably infer, that for the space of 7000 Years and more, neither the Sun, nor any of the rest of the Seven Governing Powers of Nature have ever swerved in the least from their original Courses? And if so; what will become of all our most labour'd modern Theories, which pretend, that the Earth (if not the whole Frame of things) suffered sundry great and extraordinary Changes and Alterations at the Universal Deluge? Nay, what will become of the Newtonian Philosophy itself; which maintains, that all Nature is, and always has been, in a constant and perpetual Struggle; and, as a necessary Consequence of those very Laws, which they pretend keep all Things in Order, tending by sure, though slow Degrees to a Total Dissolution *?*

* The great Author, in the *Latin* Edition of his *Opticks*, printed at *London*, 1706. pag. 345, 346. expresses himself thus: *Nam dum cometæ moventur in orbibus valde excentricis, undique & quoquoersum in omnes cœli partes; utique nullo modo fieri potuit, ut cæco fato tribuendum sit, quod planetæ in orbibus concentricis motu consimili ferantur eodem omnes: exceptis ni-*
c mirum

xviii The P R E F A C E.

7. *If the ancient Jews, Egyptians, and Chaldeans made use of no other but a Lunar*

mirum irregularitatibus quibusdam vix notatu dignis, quæ ex mutuis cometarum & planetarum in se invicem actionibus oriri potuerint, quæque verisimile est fore ut longinquitate temporis majores usque evadant, donec hæc naturæ compages MANUM EMENDATRICEM sit tandem desideratura. And again, in the second Edition of his *Principia*, printed at Cambridge, 1713. pag. 480, 481. Cæterum cometæ ob magnum eorum numerum, & magnam apheliorum a sole distantiam, & longam moram in apheliis, per gravitates in se mutuo nonnihil turbari debent, & eorum eccentricitates & revolutionum tempora nunc augeri aliquantulum, nunc diminui. — Cometa qui anno 1680 apparuit, minus distabat a sole in perihelio suo quam parte sexta diametri solis; & propter summam velocitatem in vicinia illa, & densitatem aliquam atmosphæræ Solis, resistentiam nonnullam sentire debuit, & aliquantulum retardari, & propius ad Solem accedere: & singulis revolutionibus accedendo ad Solem, INCIDET IS TANDEM IN CORPUS SOLIS. Sed & in aphelio ubi tardissime movetur, aliquando per attractionem aliorum cometarum retardari potest & subinde in SOLEM INCIDERE. Sic etiam stellæ fixæ quæ paulatim expirant in lucem & vapores, cometis in ipsis incidentibus resciri possunt: & novo alimento accensæ pro stellis novis haberi. Vapores autem, qui ex Sole & stellis fixis & caudis cometarum oriuntur, incidere possunt per gravitatem suam in atmosphæris planetarum, & ibi condensari & converti in aquam & spiritus humidos, & subinde per lentum calorem in sales, & sulphura, & tincturas, & limum, & lutum, & argillam, & arenam, & lapides & coralla, & substantias alias terrestres paulatim migrare. DECRESCENTE autem CORPORE SOLIS MOTUS MEDII PLANETARUM CIRCA SOLEM PAULATIM TARDESCENT, & CRESCENTE TERRA MOTUS MEDIUS LUNÆ CIRCUM TERRAM PAULATIM AUGEBITUR. *Et collatis quidem observationibus eclipsium Babylonicis cum iis Albategnii, & cum Hodiernis, HALLEIUS noster motum medium Lunæ cum motu diurno terræ collatum, paulatim accelerari, primus omnium quod sciam deprehendit.* The great Author assures us soon after (*ib. p. 484.*) *Quod HYPOTHESES non fingit*: But did he not a little forget himself here? As for Dr. *Halley*, he tells us indeed (*Phil. Trans. N^o. 218.*) That he thinks he can demonstrate that the Moon's Motion does accelerate; and that he will (God willing) one Day make it appear to the Publick: But Promises are one thing, and Demonstration is another.

Year

The P R E F A C E. xix

Year at first, and afterwards of a Year of 365 Days; is it not natural to conclude, that, if they had any Lunar Cycle at all, it must have consisted of 25 Egyptian Years; or if they had any Solar Cycle, that it must have consisted of seven of their Years, and no more? And if so; to what Purpose or with what Propriety can the Julian Period be applied towards settling or illustrating the History or Chronology of those early Times? A Period compounded of a Lunar Cycle of 19 Years; of a Solar Cycle of 28 Years; and of the Roman Indiction of 15 Years; all suited and adapted to the Year introduced by Julius Cæsar, and to no other?

I shall only add, that, if I should ever trouble the World again with any more of my Thoughts; it will probably be with a Dissertation on the divine Authority of the Version of the Septuagint.

London, 21 February, 1740.

Stylo Anglicano.

BOOKS Printed for T. WOODWARD,
at the Half-Moon, between the Temple-
Gates, Fleet-Street.

1. **A** Vindication of the History of the *Septuagint* from the Misrepresentations of the learned *Scaliger*, *Dupin*, *Dr. Hody*, *Dr. Prideaux*, and other modern Criticks.
2. A Critical Examination of the Holy Gospels according to *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke*, with regard to the History of the Birth and Infancy of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, price 2 s. each.
3. *Plato's* Dialogue of the Immortality of the Soul, translated from the *Greek* by *Mr. Theobald*.
4. *Bishop Atterbury's* Sermons, in 4 vols. 8vo.
5. A Discourse of the visible and invisible Church of *Christ*, in which it is shewn, that the Power claimed by the Officers of the visible Church are not inconsistent with the Supremacy of *Christ* as Head, or with the Rights and Liberties of *Christians* as Members of the invisible Church, by *John Rogers*, D. D. Vicar of *St. Giles's Cripplegate*, Canon of *Wells*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty. The fifth Edition.
6. State of the Proceedings of the Corporation of the Governors of the Bounty of *Queen Anne*, for the Augmentation of the Maintenance of the poor Clergy; giving a particular Account of their Constitution, Benefactions, and Augmentations, with Directions to such as desire to become Benefactors to so pious and charitable a Work. The second Edition, with a Continuation to *Christmas 1720*, by *Mr. Eaton*.
7. The important Case of Conscience practically resolved, wherein lies that exact Righteousness which is required between Man and Man? A Sermon preached at *Cripplegate* in the Year 1661, by *John Tillotson*, M. A. and then published by himself, but hitherto omitted in his Lordship's Works.
8. *Bishop Rundle's* Sermon before the Society of *Georgia*.
9. *Mr. Warner's* Sermon preached at the annual Visitation of the Lord Bishop of *Winchester* at *Andover* in the County of *Southampton*, Sept. 14. 1737.
10. A Sermon preached before the Trustees for establishing the Colony of *Georgia* in *America*, and before the Associates of the late Rev^d. *Dr. Thomas Bray*, for converting the Negroes in the *Brittish* Plantations, and for other good Purposes, at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish-Church of *St. Brides, Fleet-Street*, on *Thursday, March 21, 1734*. By *Stephen Hales*, D. D. Rector of *Harrington* in *Hampshire*, and Minister of *Teddington*, *Middlesex*. Published at the Desire of the Trustees and Associates.

(1)

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

CHRONOLOGY

OF THE

SEPTUAGINT.

SECT. I.

*The State of the Controversy. Vossius and
Pezron's System. Their Miscarriage. The
Design of this Essay.*

THE chief Difference between the *Chronology* of the *Hebrew Scriptures*, and *that* of the *Septuagint*, lies in those *Periods* which extend from the *Creation* of the *World* to the universal *Deluge*; and from that great *Catastrophe* to the *Birth* of *Abraham*. For, according to the *Hebrew*, the *Number of Years* in the *First* amounts only

B to

to 1656, and in the *Second* to 292. But in the *Septuagint*, the Number of Years in the *First Period* amounts unto 2256, and in the *Second* to 1072 Years. This Diversity has been long taken Notice of, as well as very much wondered at by divers great and learned Men. In the last Century, the Controversy about it was revived with great Vigour by some of the most eminent Writers of that Age. The most profoundly learned *I. Vossius* was the first, I think, who professedly undertook the Defence of the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, in Opposition to *that* of the *Hebrew*. And he was soon after succeeded in the same Province by the no less learned and industrious Father *Pexron*. And in Defence of the *Hebrew Chronology*, in Opposition to *that* of the *Septuagint*, soon after appeared the learned Fathers *Martianay* and *Le Quien*; Men of great Abilities and Distinction in the Common-Wealth of Letters.

It might indeed have been expected that Writers of their extensive Learning and indefatigable Application, might have been able to have satisfied the World on which Side of the Question the Truth, or at least, the greatest Probability lyes; and by that Means have put a final End to the Dispute. But this, we see, has not been the Case: for, to this Day,

Day, the World is still divided in Opinion upon the same Point.

IF I might presume to offer a Reason for this Miscarriage, I would say, as has been said of some other very great Men in another way, that there were *Faults* on *both Sides*. *Vossius* and *Pezron*, in my humble Opinion, by taking the Chronology of *Josephus* for the *sole Basis* of their *System*, set out wrong; and were by that Means driven to maintain Things for which they had no Authority; nothing but mere Conjecture. And this, if I mistake not, laid their System so open to Attacks, and gave such Advantage to their Adversaries, that it is not to be wondered, if they could not always defend the Cause which they pretended to support, so successfully as might have been expected from such able Hands. In short, *Vossius* and *Pezron* seem to me to have acted too much the Part of *were Theorists* upon this Occasion. In order to support the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, they gave too much into the Modern Way of forming *Systems* out of their own Heads; and then arguing from them. And on the other Hand, *Le Quien* and *Martianay*, instead of duly enough attending to the main Points upon which the whole Debate ought to have turned, have levelled their Artillery

chiefly against the weaker and less defensible Places of their Adversaries System. And by these Means, the Attention of most Readers has been insensibly diverted and drawn away from the chief Point of View; and they have been left almost as much in the Dark, after having read both Sides, as they were at first before they began to read either.

As my Design in this Essay, is not implicitly and at Random to espouse and defend, or to expose and confute the Notions and Opinions of any other Writer, how eminent or learned soever he may be: But only to discover the Truth, or at least its nearest Resemblance, be it where or with whom it will; and to lay it fairly before the Reader, for his Consideration in the best and clearest Manner that I am able: I shall take the Liberty in the first Place, to lay before the Reader, in two separate Tables, and in as distinct a Manner as I can, a *Synopsis* of the *Chronology* of the *two Periods* which we are to consider, according to the *Hebrew*, the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint*, and *Josephus*. II. I shall offer such Remarks and Observations upon each of them, as I hope, will in some Measure enable the Reader to judge, which of the *two Chronologies*, the *Hebrew* or that of the *Septuagint* shall

154

TIME 04:57:13.3 AM

of the SEPTUAGINT.

tuagint, we ought to prefer: And, III. I shall in the last Place consider the most material Objections that have at any Time been urged against that System, which I shall take the Liberty to give the Preference to; and endeavour to give such Answers and Solutions to them, as, I flatter myself, will, if not fully determine the Point, yet at least clearly shew on which side of the Question the greatest Probability lies.

S E C T. II.

Remarks on the First Table.

THIS Table contains the *Chronology* of the World, from the Creation to the universal *Deluge*; and is distinguished into *four lesser Tables*; shewing in what Year of their Age the *ten antediluvian Patriarchs*, begat their *Sons* and *Successors*; how many Years each lived; and also in what Year of the World each of them was born and died; according to the *Hebrew*, the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint*, and *Josephus*. And to the End that the Reader may be the better enabled to compare them with one another, and draw proper Inferences from them; I shall take the Liberty in the first Place to make some few Remarks upon each of them, as follows;

I.

6 Of the CHRONOLOGY

I.

Remarks on the Hebrew Chronology of the First Period.

According to the Chronology of our present *Hebrew Bibles*;

1. *Adam*, who lived to be 930 Years old, lived 54 Years after the Birth of *Lamech*, the 8th in lineal Descent from himself.

2. *Seth*, who lived to be 912 Years old, lived 168 Years after the Birth of *Lamech*, the 7th in lineal Descent from himself.

3. *Enos*, who lived to be 905 Years old, lived 84 Years after the Birth of *Noah*, the 7th in lineal Descent from himself.

4. *Qainan*, who lived to be 910 Years old, lived 179 Years after the Birth of *Noah*, the 6th in lineal Descent from himself.

5. *Mabalaleel*, who lived to be 895 Years old, lived 234 Years after the Birth of *Noah*, the 5th in lineal Descent from himself.

6. *Jared*, who lived to be 962 Years old, lived 366 Years after the Birth of *Noah*, the 4th in lineal Descent from himself.

7. *Lamech*, who lived to be 777 Years old, lived 595 Years after the Birth of *Noah*, his Son.

8. *Metbu-*

8. *Methuselah*, who lived to be 969 Years old, lived 600 Years after the Birth of *Noah* his Grand-son, and died in the Year of the Deluge.

9. *Lamech*, died 5 Years before his Father *Methuselah*, and 5 Years before the Flood.

10. *Enoch*, who lived 365 Years, was translated, 57 Years after the Death of *Adam*, and 55 Years before the Death of *Seth*.

11. OUR present *Hebrew Copies* of *Genesis*, in these *Western Parts* of the World, compute 1656 Years from the Creation of the World to the Universal Deluge: But we are assured by an Author * of good Credit, that all the *Hebrew Copies* of *Genesis* amongst the Eastern

* *Ismaël Sciabmschiab*, apud *Abrahamum Eccbellensem Maronitum* in *Historia Arabum, quæ Chronico Orientali Parisiis iterum Editio* An. 1685. subjungitur, p. 172, 173. *Sciabmschiab's* Words are these; "Textus autem Hebraici inde patet Corruptela, quod a Casu Adami ad diluvium computet Annos 556. "A Diluvio vero ad Nativitatem Abrahamæ Annos 202. At Nōc ex omnium Consensu vixit post diluvium Annos 350. Colligitur itaque Nōc vitæ defunctum fuisse agente Abrahamo Annum 58, quod maxime est absurdum. &c." Upon which *Eccbellensis* makes this Remark; "Summa, seu Periodus, quæ a Creatione Mundi ad Diluvium ex Hebraico Textu fuit retactis, quæ in Perside, ubi scripsit, consuluit, Centum Annis ab illa exceditur, quæ nostra nunc exhibent in Occidente exemplaria. Ille tamen non semel testatur, non solum se plera evoluisse ejusmodi Hebraica exemplaria, sed etiam Rabbinos et Gentis Doctores adhibuisse, quemadmodum fecit quoque ante illum in suo Chronico consiciendo Hamadaddinus Ismaël princeps Hemat. Ex quo plane colligere est, exemplaria, quibus usus est uterque Ismaël, differre ab iis, quæ leguntur nunc

Eastern Jews, allow but 1556 Years to this Period.

12. WE are likewise assur'd by St. *Jerom*, that the *Hebrew Computations* were not expressed in Words at Length in the Old *Hebrew Copies*; but in small Characters scarcely visible.

13. THE present *Eastern Copies* of the *Hebrew Text* of *Genesis*, must of Necessity differ in some other Ages of the Antediluvian Patriarchs from our present *Western Copies* of the same Text; particularly in the Number of Years that *Lamech* and *Methuselah* lived. For, if in those, *Lamech* was made to live 777 Years, and *Methuselah* 969 Years, as all our *Western Copies* do; the former must have survived the Universal Deluge 95 Years, and the latter 100 Years, which is absurd to imagine.

“ nunc in Europa Judæi, nec ita sibi ubique constare, ut blaterat et rudis noster Judæus.” These two *Ishmaels Maraccius* and Dean *Prideaux* have erroneously made to be one and the same Person; as the learned *Gagnier* has observed in his Preface to *Ishmael Abulfida's Life of Mahomet*, p. 16. And hence it appears that the learned Mr. *Shuckford* is likewise greatly mistaken in saying, that “ we are sure there have been no various Readings in these Places since the Talmuds.” Connexion p. 1, pag. 56, 57.

II.

Remarks on the Samaritan Chronology of the First Period.

1. According to this Chronology, *Noah* lived 180 Years with *Enoch*; 223 Years with *Adam*; 335 Years with *Seth*; 433 Years with *Enos*; 528 Years with *Cainan*; 583 Years with *Mabalaleel*; and 600 Years with *Lamech*, *Jared* and *Methuselah*.

2. *Jared* and *Lamech*, as well as *Methuselah*, died in the very Year that the Universal Deluge happened.

3. The *Samaritan* Copy differs from the *Hebrew* as to the Age of *Jared* when he begat *Enoch*; here he is said to be only 62 Years old, but there he is said to be 162 Years old.

4. The *Samaritan* Copy differs likewise from the *Hebrew* as to the Age of *Methuselah* when he begat *Lamech*; here he is said to be only 67 Years old, and there he is said to be 187 Years old.

5. The *Samaritan* Copy differs also from the *Hebrew* as to the Age of *Lamech* when he begat *Noah*; here he is said to be only 53 Years old, and there he is said to be 182 Years old.

C

6. The

6. The *Samaritan* Copy makes *Jared*, *Lamech*, and *Methuselah*, to have died at the Ages of 847, 653, and 720 respectively; whereas our *Hebrew* Copies make the same Persons die at the Ages of 962, 777, and 969 respectively.

7. *St. Jerom* * assures us, that in his Time, some of the *Samaritan* Copies made *Methuselah* 187 Years old at the Birth of *Lamech*; and *Lamech* 182 Years old at the Birth of *Noah*.

8. If, instead of the Number 67 and 53, we replace *St. Jerom*'s Numbers only, *viz.* 187 and 182: the Sum Total of the Years from the Creation to the Deluge will amount unto 1556 Years; and in that Case, the *Samaritan* will agree exactly with the *Eastern Hebrew Copies* abovementioned.

9. But, if instead of the Number 67 and 53, we replace 187 and 182; and likewise further, suppose, That the Copists of the *Samaritan Pentateuch* might by Mistake leave out the *Gentenary* Letter, in the Life of *Jared*,

* In Hebraeis et Samaritanorum libris ita scriptum reperi: & vixit Mathusala centum octoginta septem annis, & genuit Lamech; & vixit Mathusala postquam genuit Lamech, septingentos octoginta duos annos, & genuit filios & filias. Et fuerunt omnes dies Mathusale, anni nonaginti sexaginta novem, & mortuus est. Et vixit Lamech centum octoginta duobus annis & genuit Noe. Inter Notas Cl. Montfauconii ad Hexapl. Origen. ad ver. 25, 26. cap. 5. Genes.

when

when he begat *Enoch*; and consequently, that the true Reading in the *Samaritan* was originally 162; and not 62; the *Samaritan* Copy will then agree exactly with our present *Western Hebrew* Copies.

10. The several Ages at which our present *Samaritan* Copies make *Jared*, *Lamech*, and *Methuselah* to die, seem to have been shortened on purpose to avoid the Absurdity of their surviving the Universal Deluge. This is more particularly conspicuous in the Age at which our present *Samaritan* Copies make *Methuselah* to die: For as the Period between the Creation and the Deluge, in those Copies of the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, which St. *Jerom* speaks of, amounted unto 1556 Years, and therein agreed with the *Eastern Hebrew* Copies abovementioned; whereas our present *Samaritan* Copies make the same Period amount only to 1307 Years; which makes a Difference between the one and the other of 249 Years; so we see plainly that the *Samaritans*, by making *Methuselah* live in all only 720 Years, have shortned the *Hebrew* Account of his Age by the very same Number of Years: For if, from 969, you substract 249, there will remain exactly 720.

11. If the same Rule had been followed with respect to the Ages at which *Jared* and *Lamech* died; then the Death of the former must have been placed in the Year of the World 1173, and that of the latter in the Year 1180; both before the Death of *Cainan*, notwithstanding that he was born 135 Years before the *First*, and 329 Years before the *other*; and who, according to this System, died *anno mundi* 1235. But as it could not but appear very incongruous to make *Jared* the Grandson of, and *Lamech* the 5th in Lineal Descent from *Cainan*, die before him; the Patrons of this Chronology seem to have chose rather to place the Death of *Jared* and *Lamech* in the Year of the Universal Deluge; and consequently to have fixed the several Ages at which each of them died, by barely subtracting the Year of the World when they were born, from the Year of the World in which the Flood, according to them, happened. For, if from 1307, you subtract 460, there remains 847, the Age of *Jared* at his Death; and if from 1307, you subtract 654, there remains 653, the Age of *Lamech* at his Death.

12. According to the *Samaritan* Chronology, *Noah* lived 200 Years and upwards with

with *Adam*; which appeared so improbable to an eminent *Arabian* Writer *, that he concludes from thence that the present Number, in all our *Samaritan* Copies, must needs be corrupted.

III.

Remarks on the Chronology of the Septuagint for the First Period.

1. I presume it will be admitted, that there were (and probably still are) many Copies of the *Septuagint* dispersed, and in use all over the *East*; as well as those which are come down to our Hands in these *Western Parts* of the World.

2. I presume it will likewise be admitted as most probable, if not certain, that those Numbers or *Ages* in which all the Copies of the *Septuagint*, both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Parts of the World, unanimously agree, must be the self same Numbers or *Ages* which the *LXX* Interpreters themselves ori-

* Hæc editio Samaritana indicat inter casum Adami, & diluvium annos intercessisse 1307. Porro diluvium contigit anno 600 ætatis Noë, & vixit Adam (super quem pax) ex omnium consensu annos 930. Igitur juxta hanc editionem Adam vitâ defunctus est agente Noë annum 200. (lege 223.) quod affirmare est maximum absurdum. *Ismael Sciabinsciab* in prælu- diis hystoriæ gentium, ut citatur ab *Abr. Eccbellensi* in *Supple- ment. Hister. Orient.* pag. 172.

ginally

14 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

ginally inserted into their Translation of the *Pentateuch*.

3. Since it must likewise be admitted that some Errors, Mistakes, or various Readings have, either by Design or Inadvertency, crept into all Copies whatsoever of the *Septuagint*; I presume we may and ought always to look upon that Reading as the true and original Reading of the *Septuagint*, which is most agreeable to, and best supported by other undeniable *collateral Evidence*.

4. All our *Eastern* and *Western Copies* of the *Septuagint*, unanimously agree,

That *Adam* begat *Seth* at the Age of 230 Years, and died at the Age of 930 Years.

That *Seth* begat *Enos* at the Age of 205 Years, and died at the Age of 912 Years.

That *Enos* begat *Cainan* at the Age of 190 Years, and died at the Age of 905 Years.

That *Cainan* begat *Mabalaleel* at the Age of 170 Years, and died at the Age of 910 Years.

That *Mabalaleel* begat *Jared* at the Age of 165 Years, and died at the Age of 895 Years.

That *Jared* begat *Enoch* at the Age of 162 Years, and died at the Age of 962 Years; and

That

That *Enoch* begat *Methuselah* at the Age of 165 Years, and was translated at the Age of 365 Years.

I say, all our Copies of the *Septuagint* every where, and without the least Variation, make these *Seven Patriarchs* to have had Children, and to have died at these several and respective Ages. And therefore I think it must be admitted, that these Numbers are the self same original Numbers which the *LXX Interpreters* inserted into their Translation of the *Pentateuch*.

5. Though the *Roman* and *Complutensian Editions* of the *Septuagint* make *Methuselah* to beget *Lamech* at the Age of 167 Years; yet since the *Alexandrian* and *Aldine Copies*, as well as all the *Eastern Copies* of the *Septuagint*, make *Methuselah* to beget *Lamech* at the Age of 187 Years; since *Africanus* *, the Author of the *Chronicon Pascale* †, and *St. Austin* ‡, give the Preference to these Numbers; and since the same is likewise support-

* *Apud Syncel. Chronogr. p. 20.* Exemplaria vero quædam in annum 187, ipsius Mathusala, Lamech ortum referunt, quibus *Africanus* assentitur.

† Accurati *Geneseos libri* (α' ἀρχαῖν τ' ἐνίστασις βιβλία) 187 annum Mathusala attigisse ostendunt, cum Lamech generavit, *Chron. Paschal. p. 21.*

‡ In codicibus paucioribus, sed veracioribus, Mathusala genuit Lamech anno ætat. 187. *S. August. quæst. 2. in Genes.*

ed by, and perfectly agreeable to all our present *Hebrew Copies*, I cannot but humbly be of Opinion, that this is the very Age in which the *Septuagint*, in its original Purity, made *Methuselah* to beget *Lamech*.

6. Though all our present *Western Editions* of the *Septuagint* make *Lamech* to beget *Noah* at the Age of 188 Years, and to have died at the Age of 753 Years; yet since, on the other Hand, all the *Eastern Copies* * of the *Septuagint* make *Lamech* to beget *Noah* at the Age of 182 Years, and to have died at the Age of 777 Years; since these Numbers are confirmed by all our present *Hebrew Copies*; and since it is manifest, that the other Numbers, viz. 188, and 753, are utterly inconsistent with that well known Tradition †,

* *Chron. Orientale*, Ed. Par. 1685. p. 2.

† *Abr. Eccel. in Histor. Arab. ad calcem Chron. Orient. p. 174.* Sed gravis hic occurrit difficultas de annis *Methusalem*, quæ gravissimorum patrum & scriptorum exagitavit animos, quamque libentissime amplectuntur, passimque opponunt, qui male sunt affecti erga LXX editionem, & *Hebraicam quo lubet jure, & pertinacia defendere conantur.* Si quidem secundum hujus LXX interpretum editionis subductos numeros comperitur *Mathusalem* vita defunctus esse annis post diluvium 14. Sive, ut habet *Eusebius Chronic. l. i. annis 15.* Hic error solus in causa fere fuit, ut posteriores *chronographi occidentales* LXX editione repudiata *Hebraicam* sunt secuti. *Orientales vero non item, quod nusquam ejusmodi error in eorum comperitur codicibus, aut deprehendatur, sed omnium CONSTANTISSIMA SUPPUTATIONE plane habetur, Mathusalem eodem quo contigit diluvium anno excessisse.* In eos autem *Græcos codices*, ex quibus id erroris colligitur, eum quoque casu & fortuito irrepsisse manifestum est, quia tempore *D. Augustini* non omnes codices pervaserat, ut ipse testatur quæst. 2 *Genes.*

which places the Death of *Methuselah* in the very Year of the Deluge; I cannot but further humbly conclude, that the Numbers 182 and 777 are the self same Numbers which the *LXX Interpreters* inserted into their Version of the *Pentateuch* †.

7. The chief Difference in this Period between the *Chronology* of our present *Hebrew* Copies, and that of the *Septuagint*, consists in the Ages of *Adam*, *Seth*, *Enos*, *Cainan*, *Mabalaleel* and *Enoch* *, at the Time of their having Children; the *Septuagint* making each

2. Genes. multo minus etiam tempore Josephi, Africani, Eusebii et aliorum, qui licet LXX secuti sint, hanc tamen corruptelam, minime animadverterunt. Ουολογούμενοι δὲ ἐν ΠΑΪΣΙΝ, ὅτι τὰς αἰώνων Μακροβιότητων. Ἐν δὲ Μαθησαίᾳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ Καλαχλυσμῷ τίθηται. Syncel. Chron. p. 20. Bochart. Geograph. Sacr. l. 1. c. 15. col. 51. Alterius Enochii filius Methuselah, anno diluvii mortuus, id significabat ipso nomine, quod illi a patre inditum prophetico spiritu.

† I. Vossius, who, it would seem, had not consulted any of the Eastern Copies of the Septuagint, does yet conjecture, that the Number 188 is a Mistake; and that the Septuagint had originally the Number 182, as the present Hebrew, Samaritan, and Josephus have it. Error tamen, says he, hic videtur in Noachi tempore Natali. Nempe is natus non 188 anno Lamechi, sed vero 182. Sic Hebraeus, & Samaritanus codices, sic quoque Josephus. Itaque non dubito, quin ita etiam prius fuerit in versione Septuaginta interpretum. De ætate mundi, c. 4. p. 253.

* S. August. de civitate Dei l. 15. c. 13. In his autem quibus continuatur ipsius mendositatis similitudo, ita ut ante genitum filium qui ordini inseritur, alibi supersint centum anni, alibi desint: post genitum autem, ubi deerant, supersint: ubi supererant, desint, ut summa conveniat: & hoc in prima, secunda, tertia, quarta, quinta, septima generatione invenitur, videtur habere quandam si dici potest, error ipse constantiam; nec casum redolet, sed industriam.

of them to be an hundred Years older at those Times respectively than our *Hebrew* Text does. And hence it comes to pass that this Period, according to the *Septuagint*, exceeds the same Period, according to the *Hebrew*, exactly by 600 Years.

8. Without entering into the Question here, whether these Differences arose at first from Design, or by Accident, it appears evidently, that the *Jews* might, if they thought fit so to do, thus shorten this first Period, without being under any Necessity of making any Alterations in the Ages at which the several Antediluvian Patriarchs died; nay, they might, if they had so thought fit, have shortned the same 100 Years more, by making *Jared* beget *Enoch* at the Age of 62 instead of 162 Years. But had they still shortned this Period further, by making *Methuselah* to have begot *Lamech* at the Age of 87 instead of 187 Years; or *Lamech* to have begot *Noah* at the Age of 82 instead of 182 Years; they must, in consequence of such farther Alterations, either have altered the Ages at which *Lamech* and *Methuselah* died from what they were before, both in the *Hebrew* and in the *Septuagint*; or they must have run into the Absurdity of making these two Patriarchs survive

vive the Deluge many Years. And this I take to be the true Reason why, if the *Jews* did at any time take upon them to shorten the Years of six Antediluvian Patriarchs, before they had their Children, they might not think it advisable to alter the Ages at which *Methuselah* and *Lamech* begat their Sons respectively.

9. It is observable that, according to the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, *Adam* lived only to see the 4th Generation from himself; that *Seth*, *Enos*, *Cainan*, and *Mabalaleel* lived each to see the 5th; that *Jared* lived only to see the 4th; *Methuselah* lived only to see the 3^d; and that *Enoch* and *Lamech* lived only to see the 2^d Generation from themselves.

10. The great *Selden*, from a Manuscript Copy of the Annals of *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, informs us *, that the *Eastern* Nation had an ancient received Tradition, that *Seth* died in the 20th Year of *Enoch*; and that *Enos* died in the 53^d Year of *Methuselah*; both which agree exactly with the Chro-

* *De anno civili vet. Judeor. pag. 44, 45. Ed. Lond. 1644.* Verum scimus apud orientales ejusmodi quam plurima alia reperiri velut ex avorum *sententiis receptissimis*; quod maxime liquet ex annalibus MSS. *Eutychii* patriarchæ Alexandrini, qui etiam veterum patriarcharum ab ipso *Ada* dies e monumentis in oriente antiquitus *pro fide dignis habitis* exhibet emortuales.—Similiter *Sethum* ait mortuum fuisse anno vigesimo ætatis *Enochi*.—Dein & *Enosum* tradit obiisse anno ætatis *Methuselahæ* 53.

nology of the *Septuagint*; but differ widely from that of all our present *Hebrew Copies*.

11. In the *Beresith Raba*, a Book of great Authority amongst the *Jews*, the Rabbins affirm \dagger , that *Adam* abstained from his Wife *Eve*, after the Death of *Abel*, 130 Years: after which, they say, he knew her again, and

\dagger *Abraham. Eccbel. in hislor. Arabum et supra, pag. 175.* Ad corruptelam illam in ætatum patriarcharum numeros inveciam quod attinet, potius Judæorum Malitiæ, ne pauperem Messiam præter spem & genium reciperent, confidenter adscribenda est juxta orientalium omnium authorum opinionem, quam LXX interpretibus. Quod quidem ex iis, qui Rabbiorum antiquissimi perhibent de Adami ætate ante genitum Seth clarissime evincitur. In Beresith Raba, qui liber est maximæ authoritatis apud ipsos Judæos, tradunt Rabbini, Adamum ab Eva, uxore abstinuissse post Abelis necem annos 130, quibus elapsis cognovit eam iterum, quæ concipiens peperit ei Seth; ex his autem videntur Judæi putare annos Adami a morte Abelis ad nativitatem Seth solum, rejectis iis, qui necem illam antecesserunt. Hanc receptissimam Hebræorum traditionem citant R. Moyses Aegyptius in *Mare Nebochim* l. 1. c. 7. Midras Tanchuma sive *Jelammedenu*; R. Selemo in *Gen.* 4. 25. Elias in *Thish.* voce ליליח, & alii. At quis cordatus & intellectu præditus facile sibi persuadebit, eodem Adami creationis anno Cainum, & Abelem genitos fuisse, ac eodem anno contigisse fratricidium? Necessario igitur sequitur Adamum, cum genuit Seth, ætate majorem fuisse quam 130 annorum quos ipsi tribuit præfens Judæus textus a sua creatione ad nativitatem Seth; & sane multo vero similis est ex illius temporis conditione Abelem vitæ defunctum fuisse annos agentem 100, qui additi annis 130, quibus Adam abstinuit ab Eva post illam necem, consent anni 230, quos Adamo LXX editio tribuit. Huic opinioni de abstinentia Adami eo temporis intervallo orientales omnes adæquuntur. Videtis Georgium Elmacinum parte 1. sui *chronici*; Gregorium Barhebræum, lib. 1. & alios. Nec difficultati satis responsum esse arbitrentur, qui opinionem hanc fabulis accensent, sola assertionem, nulla probatione accedente, præsertim cum præter universalem assensum non parvi, aut levis Roboris argumentum a LXX autoritate habeat.

she conceived and bare *Seth*. Now, since it is certain, that *Cain* did not murder *Abel* till they were both grown up; it follows clearly, if we depend upon this *Tradition*, that the *Jews* anciently must have reckoned more than 130 Years from the *Creation* to the Birth of *Seth*. And since we are likewise informed from another Quarter †, that *Adam* begat *Cain* in the 70th, and *Abel* in the 77th Year of the World; that *Cain* brought his Sacrifice in the 97th, and that *Abel* offered his in the 99th Year of the World, and in the 22^d Year of his Age; and that in this very Year of the World *Cain* murdered *Abel*; it is evident that both these *Traditions* agree perfectly well with one another, and with the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; which reckons 230 Years from the *Creation* to the Birth of *Seth*: But that they are utterly inconsistent with that of all our present *Hebrew* Copies, which allow only 130 Years from the *Creation* to the Birth of *Seth*.

12. Hence appears the Reasons of the Differences and Disputes amongst some of the *Greek* Fathers, concerning the *Chronology* of this Period. Errors had crept in by degrees into all their Copies of the *Septuagint*. As to the Ages of the first Seven *Patriarchs*,

† Εκ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν Γενέων apud Georg. Syncellum, ed. Par. 1652. pag. 8, 9.

both

both before and after their having Children, all their Copies agreed. But as to the next *two* they did not. Some of their Copies made *Methuselah* beget *Lamech* at the Age of 167 Years, and so our *Roman* and *Complutensian* Copies have it at this Day; and they made *Lamech* beget *Noah* at the Age of 188 Years: And by this Means they reduced the Duration of this Period to 2242 Years. Other Copies made *Methuselah* to beget *Lamech* at the Age of 187 Years, and so our *Alexandrian* and *Aldine* Copies read it at this Day; and they make *Lamech* to beget *Noah* at the aforesaid Age of 188 Years; and by this means they extended the Duration of the same Period to 2262 Years. But these Errors being now corrected, it appears that, according to the Original *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, the Length of this Period amounted only to 2256 Years.

IV.

Remarks on the Chronology of Josephus for the first Period.

Josephus is indisputably one of the most valuable Writers we have, next to the inspired Penmen of the Scriptures. And therefore
it

it is not at all to be wondered, to see the Writers in Behalf of the *Hebrew Chronology* on one Side, and those who contend for *that* of the *Septuagint* on the other, so strenuously endeavouring each to confirm their several *Systems* by the Authority of so great and eminent an Author. Great however and valuable as he is, it must nevertheless be admitted, that no ancient Author has suffered more in his *Numbers* than he has done. And perhaps it may be said with Truth, that the numerous and even glaring Corruptions which we now every where meet with in his Works, has been occasioned by nothing so much as by the great Value which all Sides have always set upon his Authority. The Case however, I hope, is not as yet so desperate but that by duly attending to *Josephus* himself, and by some other proper Helps, the true Reading of his Text, even in those Places which relate to the Chronology of the Antediluvian World, may still be restored and ascertained. In order to make this appear, I shall beg leave to observe,

I. In the Second Chapter of the Twelfth Book of the *Antiquities*, *Josephus* has given us an excellent Abridgment of the History of the Version of the *Septuagint*, shewing upon
what

what occasion, by whom, and in what Manner it was made. And from this Account it appears, that he looked upon this Version as an exact and faithful Translation of the *Hebrew Scriptures into Greek* *.

2. I think, it evidently appears from *Josephus* himself, that when he was writing the *Chronology* of the *Antediluvian World*, he had then *before* him, and actually made use of the *Version of the Septuagint*, and not the *original Hebrew Text itself*. This, if I have any Judgment, appears clearly by comparing the *Hebrew Names* of the *Antediluvian Patriarchs*, as they are set down in the *Interlineary Version of Arias Montanus*, with those of the *LXX* †, and *Josephus* ‡. As for Example; *Seth* in the *Hebrew* is called *Seth*; in the *Septuagint* Σηθ; and in *Josephus* Σηθ, with an η, as they have it, and not an ε; *Enos*

* Οὐ δὲ αἱ μάλιστα φιλοτιμίαι καὶ φιλοπόνησις τῶν ἱερώνυμων ἀναβῆναι ποιοῦμαι, &c. — ἔκδοσαν τε πάντες — ἰππὶ καλῶς τὸ εἰρηνικὸν ἀνέστησαν, καὶ διαμένοντες ταῦτ' αἱ ἔχοντες, καὶ μὴ μετακινῶν αὐτά, &c. *Joseph. Antiq. l. 12. c. 2. p. 518. Ed. Ox. 1720.* Several eminent Criticks, I must own, have laboured hard to invalidate the Testimony of *Josephus* in favour of this Version; But, as I have fully considered, and as I apprehend, satisfactorily answered all their Objections in another little Tract, intituled, *A Vindication of the History of the Septuagint*, I hope I may be excused from taking any further Notice of them in this Place.

† *Gen. v. 3. — 31.*

‡ *Antiq. l. 1. c. 3. §. 4. p. 11, 12,*

in

in the *Hebrew* is called *Enos*; in the *Septuagint* Ἐνῶς, and by *Josephus* ἘνωσⓈ, with an ω as they have it, and the Addition of a *Greek* Termination; *Cainan* in the *Hebrew* is called *Chenan*, in the *Septuagint* Καῖνᾶν, and by *Josephus* Kawās, which differs in nothing from the other, but in giving it a Termination more suitable to the *Greek* Idiom; *Mahalaleel* in *Hebrew* is called *Mahalalel*, in the *Septuagint* Μαχαλαήλ, and by *Josephus* short Μαλᾶν-λⓈ, with an η, and leaving out the reduplicating Syllable; *Jared* in *Hebrew* is called *Jared*, in the *Septuagint* Ἰάρηδ, and by *Josephus* ἸάρηδⓈ, with an ε, as they have it; *Enoch* in *Hebrew* is called *Chanoch*, in the *Septuagint* Ἐνωχ, and by *Josephus* ἈνωχⓈ, or as it is in some of the printed Editions Ἐνω-χⓈ, with an E and an Ω as they have it; *Metbuselab* in *Hebrew* is called *Metbuselach*, in the *Septuagint* Μαθυσάλα, and by *Josephus* Μαθυσάλας, exactly after the *Septuagint*, bating the *Greek* Termination; *Lamech* in the *Hebrew* is called *Lamech*, in the *Septuagint* Λάμειχ, and by *Josephus* ΛάμειχⓈ, with an ε as they have it; *Noah* in the *Hebrew* is called *Noach*, in the *Septuagint* Νῶς, and by *Josephus* Νῶος, exactly the same with the LXX, with the Addition only of a *Greek* Termination.

26 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

tion. Now this being the Case, can it be made a Question, whether *Josephus* had the Version of the LXX before him, when he was writing the *Chronology* of the *Antediluvian* World; and whether he made any Use of it upon that Occasion, or not? Can it be imagined that he could write those Names from a *Hebrew* Copy, exactly as the LXX had done about 400 Years before from theirs, without having their Version before him for his Guide?

3. It appears from *Josephus* *, that *Adam* begat *Seth* at the Age of 230 Years; *Αδάμων μὲν ἐν τετρακοσίων ἤδη καὶ διακοσίοισιν ἔτι γεγονότι, πατρὶς Σήθους γένεσθαι. ὃς ἑξακόσια μὲν καὶ τετρακόντα ἐβίωσεν ἔτη*, i. e. *Adam* siquidem, cum esset triginta et ducentorum annorum, *Sethus* filius natus est: qui *Adamus* nongentos & triginta vixit annos. In this Reading all our printed Greek Copies, and all the Latin Versions agree. And that *Josephus* wrote this Passage so himself, is to me evident beyond Contradiction, from another Place †, where likewise all the Manuscripts, printed Copies, and Latin Versions unanimously agree; in which he tells us that *Ἀδάμος ὁ πρῶτος ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως*.

* *Antiq. l. 1. c. 3. §. 4. p. 11.*

† *Antiq. l. 1. c. 2. §. 3. p. 9.*

Ἀβὲλ μὲν ἰσφαγμένος, Καίος δὲ Ἀδὰμ τὸ ἑκὼν φόνον
 πεφουγότες, παιδοποιῶν ἐφρονίζε. καὶ δυνῶς εἶχεν
 αὐτὸν γενέσεως ἕως, ἔτη τετράκοντ' ἤδη καὶ Ἀβελόσια
 ἡνωτότα τῷ βίῳ, πρὸς οἷς ἕτερα ζήσας ἐπτακόσια τε-
 λευῖα. γίνεσθαι μὲν ἐν παῖδες αὐτῷ, ἄλλοι τε
 πλείους, καὶ Σῆθος, i. e. *Adamus autem primus
 e terra factus—postquam Abel fuerat occi-
 sus, & Cain propter cædem ejus solum vertisset,
 de liberis procreandis cogitabat. Vehementi
 enim prolis desiderio tenebatur, annos jam agens
 TRIGINTA & DUCENTOS; quibus cum acces-
 sissent alteri SEPTINGENTI, tandem vitâ de-
 functus est, et quidem illi nati sunt filii com-
 plures, & inter hos Sethus. Which in Sense
 is to this Effect, That Adam, after the Mur-
 der of Abel, and the Banishment of Cain, be-
 gan to beget Children at the Age of 230 Years,
 and among them Seth; and that after this he
 lived 700 Years, and then died. And con-
 sonant to this we read in the LXX*, Εἰσε δὲ
 Ἀδὰμ Ἀβελόσια καὶ τετράκοντα ἔτη, καὶ ἐγέννησε κατὰ
 τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτῷ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐπωνό-
 μασε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Σῆθ. Εγένοντο δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι
 Ἀδὰμ, ὡς εἰσε μὲν τὸ γενῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸ Σῆθ, ἔτη
 ἐπτακόσια, καὶ ἐγέννησεν ὕψος καὶ θυγατέρας. Καὶ
 ἐγένοντο πάσαι αἱ ἡμέραι Ἀδὰμ ὡς εἰσε ἑπτακόσια
 καὶ τετράκοντα ἔτη, καὶ ἀπέθανεν, that is, That Adam*

lived 230 Years, and begat a Son in his own Likeness, after his Image, and called his Name Seth; and the Days of Adam, after he had begotten Seth, were 700 Years; and he begat Sons and Daughters. And all the Days that Adam lived were 930 Years; and he died. But in all our present Hebrew Copies we read thus; *That Adam lived 130 Years, and begat a Son in his own Likeness, after his Image, and called his Name Seth; and the Days of Adam after he had begotten Seth were 800 Years: and he begat Sons and Daughters. And all the Days that Adam lived were 930 Years, and he died.* Now here it is most evident that *Josephus* agrees exactly with all our present Copies of the LXX; and it is as evident, that he differs from all our present Copies of the Hebrew Text. The Question then is, how we are to account for this Agreement between *Josephus* and the LXX? or for this difference between *him* and the Hebrew? Will any of our modern Criticks still say, that both the abovementioned Places in *Josephus* are corrupted? Neither their Word, nor any of their bare Conjectures, they must give me leave to tell them, will be taken for this. Let them produce good Authority, or at least Probabilities for what they alledge; and then we will either believe them, or give pro-

proportionable Credit to what they say. But in the mean time, and until they can do this, I must insist upon it, that the Text in both those Places has not been corrupted. And therefore I must farther take the Liberty to ask; when *Josephus* wrote this Part of his Antiquities, did the *Hebrew* Copy or Copies, which were then known and in Use among the *Jews* in his time, agree with the Version of the LXX, or did they not? If they did, is it not manifest that all our present *Hebrew* Copies must have been corrupted since? If they did not, is it not as manifest, that *Josephus* here preferred the Version of the LXX, as more correct than any of the *Hebrew* Copies of his own time?

4. Since it is certain that *Josephus* did follow the Chronology of the LXX, with regard to the Age of *Adam*, when he begat *Seth*; it follows demonstrably that his Chronology for this Period cannot possibly be made to agree with that of our present *Hebrew* Copies. According to the first Edition of *Josephus* in *Greek*, which was printed at *Basil*, Ann. 1544; *Adam* begat *Seth* at 230; *Seth* begat *Enos* at 205; *Enos* begat *Cainan* at 190; *Cainan* begat *Mabalaleel* at 170; *Mabalaleel* begat *Jared* at 162; *Jared* begat *Enoch* at 162; *Enoch* begat *Methuselah* at 105; *Methuselah*

Metbuselab begat *Lamech* at 187; *Lamech* begat *Noah* at 82; and *Noah* was 600 Years old, when the *Flood* came and destroyed the whole Earth: and all these Sums together amount unto 2093 Years. Again, according to *Ruffinus's* Version; *Adam* begat *Seth* at 230; *Seth* begat *Enos* at 105; *Enos* begat *Cainan* at 90; *Cainan* begat *Mabalaleel* at 70; *Mabalaleel* begat *Jared* at 162; *Jared* begat *Enoch* at 162; *Enoch* begat *Metbuselab* at 105; *Metbuselab* begat *Lamech* at 187; *Lamech* begat *Noah* at 182; and *Noah* was 600 Years old when the *Flood* happened; and all these Sums together amount unto 1893 Years. But neither of these Sums agree with the Sums in our *Eastern* or *Western Hebrew Copies*; the former making this Period to amount unto 1556; and the latter to 1656 Years. Nor can the Sum of the Particulars in the *Greek* of *Josephus*, or in the *Latin Version* commonly ascribed to *Ruffinus*, be made to agree with either of the said Sums, by any Correction whatsoever of the several particular Numbers, without making the Numbers so corrected differ from the corresponding Numbers in the same *Hebrew Copies*; or by altering the Age, in which *Adam* in all *Josephus's* Copies, *Greek* as well as *Latin*, is said to have begotten *Seth*.

5. Since

5. Since it is certain that *Josephus* had the Version of the LXX before him, when he wrote this Part of his Antiquities; and that he has followed their Chronology with regard to the Age of *Adam* when he begat *Seth*; and since it cannot be denied but that most of the other Ages of the *Antediluvian Patriarchs* in *Josephus* do likewise agree exactly with those in the LXX; I humbly think there is no room to doubt, but that those Ages in *Josephus* which now differ from the LXX, did likewise originally agree with them: and consequently, that the Sum of the Years resulting from the several Ages in *Josephus* for this Period, did also at first exactly agree with that which we have before deduced from the LXX. To explain this a little more particularly; though *Mabalaleel* in the *Basil* Edition of 1544, and in the other Editions which have been since made from that, is said to have begotten *Jared* at the Age of 162 Years; yet since other MSS * of *Josephus* make *Mabalaleel* to beget *Jared* at the Age of 165 Years; and since this Reading agrees with that of the *Septuagint*, we are surely at liberty to give it the Preference, if we think fit. Now this being admitted, it appears at first sight, that out of 10 Ages in

* Dr. Bernard upon the Place, mentions 4.

Josephus, and in the *Septuagint*, 8 of those in *Josephus* to this Day, agree exactly with 8 of those in the *LXX*; viz. the Ages at which *Adam*, *Seth*, *Enos*, *Cainan*, *Mabalaleel*, *Jared*, and *Methuselah* begat their Children, and the Age of *Noah* at the Deluge. And therefore, I presume, we may fairly conclude, that according to *Josephus*, the Ages of *Enoch* and *Lamech*, when they begat their Children, did likewise at first agree with the Ages which the *Septuagint* has assigned to them. And with Submission, I think I am still further warranted in this; because, though some of our present Greek Copies of *Josephus* make *Lamech* to beget *Noah* at the Age of 82 Years; yet some Manuscripts*, as well as *Eutychius* and *Ruffinus* have preserved the true Reading, viz. 182 Years; and then there remains out of ten, only the Age of *Enoch*, to be rectified, when he begat *Methuselah*. Now, since some MSS of *Josephus* make *Enoch* to beget *Methuselah* at the Age of 65 Years; and since the *Basil* Edition of *Josephus* as well as *Ruffinus*, make *Enoch* to beget *Methuselah* at the Age of 105 Years, and consequently differs as to this both from the *Habrew* and the *Septuagint*; it is manifest that the Age here must have been corrupted. And the only Question is how it

* See Dr. Bernard upon the Place.

is to be corrected. To correct it, so as to make it agree with the *Hebrew* will serve no Purpose; because I have already shewn, That it is impossible to correct the Ages in *Josephus*, so as to make the Sum total agree with that of the *Hebrew* Chronology. But if we correct it so as to make it agree with the LXX, we shall then entirely reconcile *Josephus's* Chronology to That of the LXX. And therefore, I humbly think, we cannot hesitate one Moment which to chuse. For, if we suppose the Age of *Enoch*, when he begat *Methuselah*, to have been copied by Mistake 65 or 105 Years, for 165 Years, all the Differences about the Duration of this Period, between the LXX and *Josephus* will entirely vanish. Then it will follow that, according to *Josephus*, *Adam* begat *Seth* at the Age of 230; *Seth* begat *Enos* at the Age of 205; *Enos* begat *Cainan* at the Age of 190; *Cainan* begat *Mabalaleel* at the Age of 170; *Mabalaleel* begat *Jared* at the Age of 165 Years; *Jared* begat *Enoch* at the Age of 162; *Enoch* begat *Methuselah* at the Age of 165; *Methuselah* begat *Lamech* at the Age of 187; *Lamech* begat *Noah* at the Age of 182; and *Noah* was 600 Years old, when the Flood happened; and all these several Ages summed up together, will amount unto 2256 Years; which

F

agrees

agrees exactly with the *Version* of the *Septuagint* *.

6. The Premises considered; we may now easily rectify a Mistake in *Josephus*, which has given occasion to great Disputes among the Learned. In the Paragraph † immediately preceding That which contains the several Particulars of his *antediluvian* Chronology; we read; χρόνⓄ ἡ ἔτⓄ ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ τῆ πρώτης γενότⓄ ἔτων ὑπῆρξε διχιλίων ἑξακοσίων πενήκοντα ἕξ. Ἀναγέγραπται ἡ ὁ χρόνⓄ ἐν ͵Ϟ ἱεραῖς βίβλοις. Σημειουμένων μετὰ πολλῆς ἀκρίβειας ἥ τότε καὶ τὰς ἡμέρας τῆ ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τὰς τελευταίς. i. e. *Tempus vero hoc ab Adamo primo homine (ad diluvium) annorum erat bis mille sexcentorum quinquaginta sex. In libros autem sacros relatum est tempus: Istius ætatis hominibus multa cum diligentia notantibus virorum illustrium natales & obitus.* Now, that there is some Mistake or other in the Words διχιλίων ἑξακοσίων πενήκοντα ἕξ, anno-

* Mr. *Whiston* roundly asserts, That the *Septuagint* has now no fewer than 600 Years in six Generations before the Flood, which are not owned either by the *Hebrew*, or the *Samaritan*, or *Josephus*; and another 100 unsupported by any but the *Hebrew*, where it has been it self, not improbably corrupted also. So that there are now probably no fewer than 700 Years in the LXX before the Flood, which are no better than *Interpolations*. *Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament*, p. 116. With what Truth or Probability this is asserted, let the Reader judge.

† *Antiq.* l. 1. c. 3. § 3. p. 11.

rum

rum bis mille sexcentorum quinquaginta sex, is agreed on all hands; and as all our Copies of Josephus, printed as well as manuscript, Greek as well as Latin, agree in this reading, it is certain that the Corruption in this Place must be of a very long standing. Now there being but two ways to rectify this Mistake; one, by supposing, That instead of the Words in question, Josephus wrote ἔτων χιλίων καὶ ἑξακοσίων πενήκοντα ἕξ; *annorum mille sexcentorum quinquaginta sex*; and the other, by supposing that he wrote ἔτων διχιλίων Ἀξακοσίων πενήκοντα ἕξ; *annorum bis mille ducentorum quinquaginta sex*. They who contend for the present Hebrew Chronology, chuse the former, because it happens to agree with the Sum of the Ages of the antediluvian Patriarchs, according to our present Western Hebrew Bibles; and on the other hand, they who prefer the Chronology of the Septuagint to that of any of the Eastern or Western Hebrew Copies, contend as strenuously for the latter. And with all due Submission, I think it will be no very difficult matter to determine which of these two Emendations we ought now to prefer. For, since it appears that there are various Readings in the Hebrew Bibles themselves, in Relation to the Chronology of this Period; the Eastern Copies making it

to consist of 1556 Years; and the Western making the same to consist of 1656 Years: And since it cannot be proved which of these two Readings is preferable to the other, I think we cannot but look upon the first of the two Emendations as uncertain at least, if not wholly inconsistent with the *Hebrew*. But if it be farther considered, that the several particular Ages of the *antediluvian Patriarchs* in *Josephus* can by no means be reconciled either to the Number 1556, or to the Number 1656, as I have already proved they cannot; then we have no other Choice left, but to admit that *Josephus* originally wrote ἔτων διαχίλιων διακοσίων πενήκοντα ἕξ, *annorum bis mille ducentorum quinquaginta sex*; because this Emendation not only agrees best with the several particular Ages of the Patriarchs (in *Josephus* himself, but likewise exactly agrees with the Chronology of the *Septuagint* for the same Period.

S E C T. III.

Remarks on the Second Table.

THIS Table contains the *Chronology* of the World from the *universal Deluge*, to the Year that *Jacob* went down with his Family into *Egypt*; and it is distinguished into four
lesser

100

Years after the Flood.	I. HEBREW.			Years after the Flood.	II. SAMARITAN.			Years after the Flood.	III. SEPTUAGINT.			Years after the Flood.	IV. JOSEPHUS.		
2	Sem	ag. 100	begat Arphaxad	2	Sem	ag. 100	begat Arphaxad	2	Sem	ag. 100	begat Arphaxad	(12)-2	Sem	aged	begat Arphaxad
37	Arphaxad	35	Salah	137	Arphaxad	135	Salah	137	Arphaxad	135	Cainan	(147)-137	Arphaxad	135	Salah
								267	Cainan	130	Salah				
67	Salah	30	Heber	267	Salah	130	Heber	350	Noah	950 dies					
				350	Noah	950 dies		397	Salah	130	begat Heber	(277)-267	Salah	130	Heber
101	Heber	34	Phaleg	401	Heber	134	begat Phaleg	502	Sem	600 dies			350	Noah	950 dies
				440	Arphaxad	438 dies		531	Heber	134	begat Phaleg	(411)-401	Heber	134	begat Phaleg
				502	Sem	600 dies		567	Arphaxad	565 dies					
131	Phaleg	30	Reu	531	Phaleg	130	begat Reu	597	Cainan	460 dies		(512)-502	Sem	600 dies	
				570	Salah	433 dies		661	Phaleg	130	begat Reu	(541)-531	Phaleg	130	begat Reu
				640	Phaleg	239 dies		727	Salah	460 dies					
163	Reu	32	Serug	663	Reu	132	begat Serug	793	Reu	132	begat Serug	(661)-661	Reu	130	Serug
				671	Heber	404 dies		801	Heber	404 dies					
193	Serug	30	Nahor	770	Reu	239 dies		870	Phaleg	339 dies		(803)-793	Serug	132	Nahor
				793	Serug	130	begat Nahor	923	Serug	130	begat Nahor				
222	Nahor	29	Terah	872	Nahor	79	Terah	1000	Reu	339 dies		(923)-872	Nahor	(120)-79	Terah
				893	Serug	230 dies		1002	Nahor	79	begat Terah				
292	Terah	70	Abraham	941	Nahor	148 dies		1072	Terah	70	Abraham	(993)-942	Terah	70	Abraham
340	Phaleg	239 dies		942	Terah	70	begat Abraham	1123	Serug	330 dies					
341	Nahor	148 dies		1017	Terah	145 dies		1131	Nahor	208 dies					
350	Noah	950 dies						1147	Terah	145 dies					
370	Reu	239 dies													
392	Abraham	100	begat Isaac	1042	Abraham	100	begat Isaac	1172	Abraham	100	begat Isaac				
393	Serug	230 dies													
427	Terah	205 dies													
440	Arphaxad	438 dies													
452	Isaac	60	begat Jacob	1102	Isaac	60	Jacob	1232	Isaac	60	begat Jacob				
467	Abraham	175 dies		1117	Abraham	175 dies		1247	Abraham	175 dies					
470	Salah	433 dies													
502	Sem	600 dies													
531	Heber	464 dies													
572	Isaac	180 dies		1222	Isaac	180 dies		1352	Isaac	180 dies					
582	Jacob	130	Goes into Egypt	1232	Jacob	130	Goes into Egypt	1362	Jacob	130	Goes into Egypt				

leffer Tables; shewing in what Year of their Age the *Patriarchs* after the *Flood* begat their Sons and Successors; how many Years each lived; and also in what Year from the Flood, each of them was born and died, according to the *Hebrew*, the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint*, and *Josephus*. But as there is little or no Dispute in Relation to the Years between the Birth of *Abraham* and *Jacob's* Descent into *Egypt*; I shall confine my Remarks upon this Period, chiefly to the Time between the *Deluge* and the Birth of *Abraham*.

I.

Remarks on the Hebrew Chronology of the Second Period.

1. According to our *Hebrew* Copies, *Sem* was an hundred Years old, and begat *Arphaxad* two Years after the *Deluge*; and he lived after he begat *Arphaxad* 500 Years; after the *Flood* 502 Years; and in all 600 Years.

2. All the *Hebrew* Copies make *Arphaxad* begot *Salah* at the Age of 35 Years; but the Disagreement between the *Hebrew*, *Onkelos*, the *Vulgate*, and the *Samaritan*, as to the Number of Years that he lived after he begat *Salah*,
seems

seems to intimate that the *Hebrew* Text in this Place has been some how or other corrupted: For, according to ~~the~~ *Hebrew*, he lived after he begat *Salab* 403 Years; according to *Onkelos*, he lived 430 Years; but according to the *Vulgate* and the *Samaritan*, he lived only 303 Years after he begat *Salab*.

3. According to our *Western Hebrew* Copies, *Salab* begat *Heber* at the Age of 30 Years; and he lived after he begat *Heber* 403 Years; in all 433 Years. But according to the *Eastern Copies*, *Salab* begat *Heber* at the Age of 30 Years; and he lived after he begat *Heber* 430 Years; in all 460 Years. And this last seems to come nearest to the true original Reading; because the Sum total, viz. 460 Years, agrees exactly with the Sum total in all our Copies of the *Septuagint*.

4. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree that *Heber* begat *Pbaleg* at the Age of 34 Years; and that he lived after he begat *Pbaleg* 430 Years; in all 464 Years.

5. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree that *Pbaleg* begat *Reu* at the Age of 30 Years; and that he lived after he begat *Reu* 209 Years; in all 239 Years: And in this Sum total the *Septuagint* and the *Samaritan* agree with the *Hebrew*. But since *Reu*, his Son and Successor, begat *Serug* at or about much the same Age that

that *Heber* begat *Phaleg*, and lived only 207 Years after the Birth of *Serug*, the Decrease all at once from 430, the Years that *Heber* lived after he begat *Phaleg*, to 209, the Years that *Phaleg* lived after he begat *Reu*, seem to be too great, and no ways suitable to the more gradual Decrease observable in the other Ages: And therefore since it seems to be more than probable that some of the other Numbers in this Place have been corrupted, we may the rather be allowed to suspect the like of this Number here.

6. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree that *Reu* begat *Serug* at the Age of 32 Years; and that he lived after he begat *Serug*, 207 Years; in all 239 Years. And in this Sum total the *Samaritan* agrees with the *Hebrew*; but the *Septuagint* makes it amount unto 339 Years.

7. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree that *Serug* begat *Nabor* at the Age of 30 Years; and that he lived after he begat *Nabor* 200 Years; in all 230 Years. And with this Sum total the *Samaritan* agrees; but the *Septuagint* makes it amount unto 330 Years.

8. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree that *Nabor* begat *Terah* at the Age of 29 Years; and that he lived after he begat *Terah* 119 Years; in all 148 Years. And with this Sum total
the

the *Samaritan* agrees; but the *Aldus* and *Alex.* MSS. make it amount unto 248 Years.

9. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree that *Terah* begat *Abraham* at the Age of 70 Years; and that he lived after he begat *Abraham* 135 Years; in all 205 Years. And with this Sum total all our Copies of the *Septuagint* agree; but the *Samaritan* makes it amount only unto 145 Years.

10. All the *Hebrew* Copies agree in making the Number of Years from the *Deluge* to the *Birth* of *Abraham*, to amount unto 292 Years, and no more. And as to the Differences between the Ages at which different Copies make *Sem* and *Salah* to have died; that relating to *Sem* makes no Alteration; and the other relating to *Salah*, makes no other Alteration in this Reckoning, but only that one of the Readings would make him live 27 Years longer than I have done in the Table. These Things being premised, it is evident, that upon the Foot of this Chronology, it would follow

11. That the *Tower* of *Babel* was built, and the *Confusion* of *Languages* happened about the 101st Year after the Flood, or about the Time of the Birth of *Phaleg*; and that thereupon in his Days, that is, between the Year.

Year 101, and the Year 131 after the Deluge, or between the Birth of *Phaleg* and the Birth of *Reu*, the Earth was divided among the Sons of *Noah*.

12. That *Noah*, *Sem*, *Arphaxad*, *Salab*, and *Heber*, were all living when the building of *Babel*, the *Confusion of Languages*, and the *Dispersion*, or *Division* of the *Earth* among the Sons of *Noah*, happened : And that *Noah* lived after the Dispersion, at least 219 Years ; *Arphaxad* 309 Years ; *Salab* 339 Years ; and *Heber* 400 Years.

13. That *Noah* lived 58 Years after *Abraham* was born ; and that he survived *Phaleg* the 5th, and *Nabor* the 8th in lineal Descent from himself.

14. That *Sem* lived 50 Years after *Jacob* was born ; and that he survived *Abraham* (as well as all the rest of his intermediate Descendants, except *Heber*) 35 Years.

15. That *Arphaxad* survived *Phaleg*, *Reu*, *Serug*, *Nabor*, and *Terab*, the 3^d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th in lineal Descent from himself,

16. That *Salab* survived *Phaleg*, *Reu*, *Serug*, *Nabor*, *Terab*, and *Abraham*, the 2^d, 3^d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th, in lineal Descent from himself.

17. That *Heber* not only survived *Phaleg*, *Reu*, *Serug*, *Nabor*, and *Terab* ; but likewise *Abraham* himself 64 Years.

G

18. That

18. That *Heber* lived 139 Years, *Sem* 110 Years; *Salab* 78 Years; *Arphaxad* 48 Years; *Terah* 35 Years; and *Serug* one Year after *Circumcision* was instituted, and after the *Covenant* was renewed to *Abraham*.

19. That *Sem* begat Children at the Age of 100 Years; the next seven Patriarchs at the Age of 35, 30, 34, 39, 32, 30, 29 Years respectively; but that the next in Succession to them, viz. *Terah*, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, did not beget Children till they attained the Ages of 70, 86, 60, and 84 Years respectively.

II.

Remarks on the Samaritan Chronology for the Second Period.

According to this Chronology,

1. *Abraham* was born 942 Years after the Deluge; which exceeds the *Hebrew Chronology* by 650 Years.

2. *Noah* died 181 Years; *Arphaxad* 71 Years; and *Sem* 29 Years before the Birth of *Phaleg*; and consequently before the *Confusion of Languages*, and the *Division of the Earth* among their Descendants.

3. All the several Patriarchs between *Noah* and *Abraham*, died before their next immediate

diate Successors; *Sem* and *Heber* only excepted.

4. *Arphaxad*, *Salah*, *Heber*, *Phaleg*, *Reu*, and *Serug*, were each older by 100 Years, when they begat their respective Sons and Successors, than the *Hebrew Chronology* makes them to have been.

5. *Nabor* was older by 50 Years, when he begat *Terah*, than the *Hebrew Chronology* makes him to have been.

6. The Proportion between the Ages at which these several *Patriarchs* begat their Children, and the Ages to which they severally lived, is more regular here than in the *Hebrew*.

7. *Terah* died at the Age of 145 Years; which is 60 Years less than the *Hebrew* makes him to have lived; and is more agreeable to the gradual Decrease in the Ages of his Ancestors, than that of 205 Years, which the *Hebrew Text* allows him. For, here *Sem*, *Arphaxad*, *Salah*, *Heber*, *Phaleg*, *Reu*, *Serug*, *Nabor*, and *Terah*, are made to die at the Age of 600, 438, 433, 404, 239, 239, 230, 148, and 145 Years respectively; and none of the Sons are made to live longer, nor indeed so long as their Fathers did before them, which is otherwise in the *Hebrew*, where *Terah* the Son is made to live to the

Age of 205 Years; and *Nabor* the Father is made to die at the Age of 148 Years.

III.

Remarks on the Chronology of the Septuagint for the Second Period.

Upon the Foot of the same Rules, which I took the Liberty to lay down in the 1st, 2^d, and 3^d Remarks, upon the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint* for the *first Period*, I observe likewise upon this,

1. That all our Copies of the *Septuagint*, in the *East* as well as in the *West*, unanimously agree,

That *Sem* begat *Arphaxad* two Years after the Flood.

That *Arphaxad* begat *Cainan* at the Age of 135 Years.

That *Salah* begat *Heber* at the Age of 130.

That *Heber* begat *Phaleg* at the Age of 134.

That *Reu* begat *Serug* at the Age of 132.

That *Serug* begat *Nabor* at the Age of 130.

That *Terah* begat *Abraham* at the Age of 70.

I say, all our Copies of the *Septuagint* every where, and without the least Variation, make these seven Patriarchs to have begotten their Sons at these several Ages respectively: And there-

therefore I think it must be admitted that these Numbers are the self-same original Numbers, which the *Seventy Interpreters* inserted into their *Version* of the *Pentateuch*.

2. As to the Age at which *Cainan* begat *Salah*, the Copies of the *Septuagint* differ: The *Eastern* making him to beget *Salah* at the Age of 139 Years; and the *Western* at the Age of 130 Years. But as all our *Western* Copies agree in this Age; and we can have no Light from the *Hebrew* or *Samaritan* Copies to determine our Choice one way more than another, I have here chosen to follow our *Western* Copies, till better Information shall offer. In the mean time, since all the Copies of the LXX, that we know any thing of, whether in the *Eastern* or in the *Western* Parts of the World, have *Cainan* in the List of the Patriarchs after the Flood, I think, I may upon good Grounds venture to affirm, That the *Seventy Interpreters* did unanimously acknowledge and insert his Name among the other Patriarchs after the Flood.

3. As to the Ages at which *Phaleg* begat *Reu*; and *Nabor* begat *Terah*; there are likewise some Differences in the several Copies of the *Septuagint*. According to the *Roman*, the *Alexandrian*, and the *Aldine* Editions, as well as all the *Eastern* Copies of the *Septuagint*,

46 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

gint, *Pbaleg* begat *Reu* at the Age of 130 Years; but according to the *Complutenſian* Edition, *Pbaleg* begat *Reu* at the Age of 134 Years. And in like manner, according to the *Alexandrian* and *Aldine* Editions, and all the *Eastern* Copies of the *Septuagint*, *Nabor* begat *Terab* at the Age of 79 * Years; but according to the *Roman* and *Complutenſian* Editions, *Nabor* begat *Terab* at the Age of 179 Years. Now, if we are willing to be governed by Authorities, and to give the Preference to thoſe Numbers which come to us the beſt vouched; I apprehend it cannot be doubted, but that thoſe Copies which make *Pbaleg* to beget *Reu* at the Age of 130 Years; and which make *Nabor* to beget *Terab* at the Age of 79 Years will ſtand the faireſt for our Approbation. And therefore, in Conformity to them, I have conſtructed the Table which we have now under Conſideration.

4. It is remarkable that in this Chronology none of the Sons die before their Fathers: They all die regularly one after another as they were born; firſt *Noah*; next *Sem*; then *Arphaxad*, &c.

5. It likewise appears by this Chronology, That *Noah* died 181 Years; and *Sem* 29

* And ſo the Author of the *Chronicon Paſchale*, pag. 48. *Cedrenus*, pag. 26. read in their Copies of the *Septuagint*.
Years

Years before the Birth of *Pbaleg*; and consequently before the *Confusion of Languages*, and the *Dispersion* which ensued thereupon: And if these great Changes did not happen, till between the 66th and the 130th Year of *Pbaleg's* Age, then *Arphaxad* and *Cainan* must likewise have been dead before they came to pass.

6. As for the Age at which *Terab* begat *Abraham*, the Learned are as yet greatly divided. Archbishop *Usher*, *Vossius*, and *Pezron*, and indeed most of our modern Chronologers contend, that *Terab* begat *Abraham* at the Age of 130 Years, which they endeavour to prove thus: According to *Gen. ch. xi. 32.* *Terab* died in *Haran* at the Age of 205 Years; According to *St. Luke, Acts ch. vii. 4.* *Abraham* did not remove from *Haran* to go into the Land of *Canaan* till after the Death of *Terab*; And according to *Gen. ch. xii. 4.* *Abraham* was but 75 Years old, when he removed from *Haran* to go into the Land of *Canaan*. And therefore, say they, if from 205 Years, the Age of *Terab* at his Death, you subtract 75 Years, the Age of *Abraham* at the same Time, there remains 130 Years for the Age of *Terab* at the Birth of *Abraham*.

Thus these learned Writers argue: but with all due Deference and Submission to such great

great and illustrious Names, I cannot say that this Way of Reasoning does by any Means satisfy me. For,

1. I believe it will not be denied, but that all the most ancient *Greek* and *Latin Chronologers* *, both before and since Our *Blessed Saviour's* Time, unanimously agree that *Terab* begat *Abraham* at the 70th Year of his Age.

2. *Josephus*, the most ancient *Jewish Historian* that we have, expressly asserts, that *Terab* begat *Abraham* at the 70th Year of his Age †.

3. All the other *Jewish Historians* and *Chronologers* ‡ from *Josephus* downwards to this Day, do likewise unanimously agree, that *Terab* begat *Abraham* at the 70th Year of his Age.

4. The *Hebrew*, the *Septuagint*, and the *Samaritan* agree, *Gen.* ch. xi. 26. that *Terab* lived 70 Years, and begat *Abraham*, *Nabor*, and *Haran*. And all the Writers abovementioned unanimously understand the Sense and Meaning of these Words to be, that *Terab* undoubtedly begat *Abraham* at the 70th Year of his Age; and

* So *Dionysius* before our Saviour, as appears from *Alex. Polyb.* apud *Euseb. de Prep. Evang.* l. 9. c. 21. pag. 425. So *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, and *Synellus* since our Saviour, as appears from *Syncl. Chronogr.* pag. 86, 87. and so the *Chronicon Pascale*, pag. 48, &c.

† *Antiq.* l. i. c. 6. § 5. pag. 26. Ed. Ox.

‡ *Sedar Holam Rabba*, c. 1. pag. 3. *Sedar Holam Sota*, pag. 98. Ed. Amstel 1699.

consequently

consequently that in all Probability he had begotten his other two Sons before he had attained to that Age. And therefore, I cannot but conclude that this must be the most natural and obvious Meaning of the Words of this Text. The Phrase is the very same here, as in the preceding Verses, where the Birth of *Abraham's* Ancestors are recorded, καὶ ἔζησιν Ἀρφαξάδ' ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα πέντε ἔτη, καὶ ἐγέννησε τὸν Καϊνᾶν;—καὶ ἔζησε Καϊνᾶν ἑκατὸν καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη, καὶ ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλαῖ—&c. Καὶ ἔζησε Θάρρα ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη, καὶ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τὸν Ναχωρ, καὶ τὸν Ἀρράν. And if the true and genuine Meaning of these Words are, That *Arphaxad* begat *Cainan* at the Age of 135 Years; That *Cainan* begat *Salah* at the Age of 130 Years, &c. then by the same Rule it will necessarily follow, that, according to the sacred Text, *Terah* begat *Abraham* at the Age of 70 Years; and consequently that in all Probability he had begotten *Nachor* and *Haran* before he had attained that Age. And indeed to imagine that the Scriptures of Truth should say, that *Terah* lived 70 Years and begat *Abraham*, *Nachor*, and *Haran*, when in Reality he had begotten none of them at that Age, nor perhaps till many Years after, is such an Abuse of Speech, as, in my humble Opinion, can never

H

comport

comport with the Accuracy of an inspired Writer.

5. As to the Question, whether *Abraham* departed from *Haran* to go into the Land of *Canaan*, before or after the Death of his Father *Terah*; I do admit that the Holy Evangelist *St. Luke*, *Acts* ch. vii. 4. is exprefs that *Abraham* did not depart from *Haran*, till after the Death of *Terah*. And if the Testimony of an *Inspired Writer* wanted any Confirmation, I might observe that, in this Particular, both *Philo* * and *Josephus* † agree entirely with the *sacred Historian*.

6. The only Point then which can admit of any doubt, and upon the Determination of which, the whole Controversy seems chiefly to turn, is the Age of *Terah* at his Death. Now, in order to resolve this Question, the Reader

* *De Migr. Abraham. pag. 415. Ed. Par. 1640.* ἰδὲν τῶν τοῦ ἐσταυρωμένου τοῖς νόμοις ἀλλοῖν ἔκθ', ὅτι πρότερον μὲν οὐ καλδαϊκῆς ἀναγὰς γῆς Ἀβραμ, ὥκῃσιν εἰς Χαρρὰν. τελευτήσας τῷ δ' αὐτῷ δ' πατρὸς οὐκ ἔτι, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς μετακίεταται, ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔτι τοῦτον ἀπὸ λείψιν περικυλᾷ. i. e. Neminem latere puto, qui modo leges sacras legit, quod Abraham primum e Chaldaeorum Terra demigrans habitavit in Charran. Ubi defuncto ipsius patre, hinc quoque profectus est, ut jam duos locos reliquerit.— And again, *De Somniis, pag. 572.* Abraham non diu in Charris durare potuit. Legitur enim eum natum annos 75, quando hanc Civitatem reliquit: quamvis Pater Tharra, qui interpretatur odoris speculatio, usque ad obitum ibi vixerat, diserte enim in sacris literis dicitur Tharram in Charris mortuum.

† *Antiq. l. i. c. 6. § 5. p. 21. l. 6—10.* But the Mistake as to the Age of *Terah* at his Death has crept into *Josephus*, as well as into the Copies of the Septuagint.

will

will be pleased to observe that the 32^d Verse of the xith Chapter of *Genesis*, which is the only Place from which the Age of *Terab* at his Death is pretended to be collected, is differently rendered in each of the *three Principal Copies* of the *Scriptures*; according to the *Interlineary Version* of *Arias Montanus*, the *Hebrew* is thus rendered, *Et fuerunt dies Terach quinque anni et ducenti anni, et mortuus est Terach in Charan.* In the *Septuagint* the Words are these; *καὶ ἐγένοντο πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι Θάρρα ἐν γῇ Χαρράν διακόσια πέντε ἔτη, καὶ ἀπὸ θανάτου Θάρρα ἐν Χαρράν* i. e. *et facti sunt omnes dies Tharra in terra Charran ducenti quinque anni; et mortuus est Tharra in Charan.* And according to the *Samaritan Copy*, the same Verse is thus rendered; *et fuerunt dies Thare centum quadraginta quinque anni; postea mortuus est Thare in Haran.*

7. Now, since it is confessed on all Hands, that none of our present Copies of the *Scriptures* are entirely free from Errors; and since it must be admitted on the other, that only one of these can be the true Reading, I apprehend that we have no other Way left to find out which of them is the true Reading, but by chusing that which shall, upon Examination, appear to be most agreeable to and

52 *Of the CHRONOLOGY*

consistent with the *Context*, and other Parts of *Holy Writ*.

8. As for the *Hebrew* ; since it appears from *Gen. xi. 26.* as has been already observed, that *Terab* begat *Abraham* at the 70th Year of his Age : From *Gen. xii. 4.* that *Abraham* was but 75 Years old when he departed from *Haran* to go into the Land of *Canaan* ; and from *St. Luke, Acts vii. 4.* that he did not remove from *Haran* till after the Death of *Terab* : It is manifest that *Terab* could not be 205 Years old at his Death ; and consequently that the *Hebrew* Text in this Place must have been corrupted.

9. As for the *Septuagint*, which makes *Terab* to have lived 205 Years in *Haran* * ; it is further manifest, that here our present *Greek* Copies have been more grossly corrupted than the *Hebrew*. For, if the whole Term of *Terab's* Life did not amount to 205 Years ;

* That the *Septuagint* here is corrupted is farther manifest from the *Chronicon Paschale*, which in one Place (pag. 48.) makes *Terab* to beget *Abraham* at the Age of (ο) Years, and to have lived after the Birth of *Abraham* 205 (οι) Years ; and yet in another (pag. 51.) he makes *Terab* to have died in the 75 (οι) Year of *Abraham's* Life, and in the 245 (σμς) Year of his Age. Which two Places can no other way be reconciled but by supposing, that in the first Place, some Transcriber or other, by a very easy Mistake, copied οι or 205, instead of οι or 75 ; And in the other σμς or 245, instead of σμς or 145 ; for, these Emendations being admitted, one will agree with the other ; and both with the *Samaritan* ; which upon this Occasion, I humbly think, has happily preserved the true and original Reading of the Text.

much

much less can it be admitted that he lived 205 Years in *Haran* after his Removal from *Ur* of the *Chaldees*.

10. As for the *Samaritan Copy* ; which makes *Terab* to have lived only 145 Years in all ; since this is perfectly consistent with *Gen.* chap. xi. 26. and chap. xii. 4. And also with *Acts* chap. vii. 4. And since *Philo Judæus* * has further informed us that *Abraham*, who lived to be 175 Years old, died the youngest of almost all his Ancestors, which he could not say with Truth, if *Terab* lived 205 Years, because it is admitted that all the rest of them to a Man, lived many Years above the Age of *Abraham* ; I say, since the Case upon the whole stands thus ; I hope I shall not be thought to have acted arbitrarily in placing the Birth of *Abraham*, conformable to all the three Copies, in the 70th Year of *Terab*, and in giving the Preference to the *Samaritan Copy*, which makes *Terab* to have lived in all but 145 Years.

11. If I may be allowed to conjecture what the original Reading of the Septuagint was, and how the Number of 205 Years came to

* De his verbis, *Responsum* Noe, p. 276. τίς ἂν ἀγνοῖ τὴν ἐπιτυχρότην ταῖς ἱερωτάταις βίβλοις, ὅτι καὶ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτοῦ πάντων ὁ Σοφώτατος Ἀβραὰμ ὀλιγοχρονιώτατος εἰσάγεται ; i. e. Quis enim versatus in sacris libris ignorat, quod ille sapientissimus Abraham brevioris ævi quam ullus penè omnium majorum suorum inducitur ?

be inserted into the Greek Text ; I imagine that the Seventy Interpreters, in order to ascertain the Time that *Terah* and *Abraham* sojourned together in *Huran*, wrote, not *Διὰ πόσια πέντε ἔτη*, but *δέκα καὶ πέντε ἔτη*, and that the whole Verse originally ran thus : *καὶ ἐξήκοντο πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι Θάρρα ἐν γῇ Χαρράν δέκα καὶ πέντε ἔτη, καὶ ἀπέθανε Θάρρα ἐν Χαρράν* ; i. e. *Et facti sunt omnes dies Tharra in terra Charran quindecim anni ; Et mortuus est Tharra in Charran*. But some of the ancient Scholiasts having wrote the corrupt *Hebrew* reading in the Margin, viz. *διὰ πόσια πέντε* ; the next Transcriber, without duly considering the Inconsistency of such a Number of Years with the other Parts of the History, inserted the same into the Text as the best Reading of the two. If the Reader should think this too bold a Conjecture, he may please to remember that the present Reading cannot be supposed to be the original Reading of the Septuagint, because those Interpreters are so far from adding to, that they are generally allowed to clear up the Difficulties that occur in the *Hebrew* Text, as in that famous place *Exod. xii. 40.* where the *Hebrew* has it, *Et habitatio filiorum Israel, quā habitaverunt in Ægypto, triginta anni Et quadringenti anni* : But the Septuagint more clearly and truly thus ; *Habitatio autem filiorum Israel, quam habitaverunt in terra Ægypto,*

gypto, & terra Chanaan, ipsi & patres eorum, anni quadringenti & triginta. And if it should be asked, Why I pitch upon 15, rather than upon any other Number of Years for the Time of Terah and Abraham's sojourning together in Haran; I answer, that besides the Aptness of these two Scripture Numbers * viz. 60 and 15, to denote the inward State and Disposition of Abraham, first, upon his removing with his Father and Family from Ur of the Chaldees; and next, from Haran into the Land of Canaan, under the divine Conduct alone; I say, besides the Aptness of these Numbers for such Purposes, the Reader, I presume, will not want to be told, that there was a Tradition in Origen's Time † that Abraham lived 60 Years before he attained to the true Knowledge of GOD; nor that Cedrenus ‡ expressly says that Abraham

* Vid. Phil. Jud. de Migratione Abraham : & Petr. Bungum de Numerorum Mysteriis ad Num. 15 & 60.

† Origenes in Schedis Combif. apud Montfaucon. in Hexapl. p. 22. ὡς ἔστιν ἡ Ἀβραάμ, οὗτος ἡλικίας αἰς ἑξήκω τὰ ἔτη τὰ πρὸς τὴν γενεάν αὐτοῦ.

‡ Cedren. Hist. Compend. p. 27. Abrahamus jam Sexagenarius (ἡλικίας ἑξήκω) cum videret se, suadendo patrem ceterosque domesticos à superstitioso simulacrorum cultu deducere non posse, noctu clam omnibus sanum simulacrorum incendit. Quæ cum conflagrarent, fratres re intellecta prosiluerunt, ut ex medio ignis simulacra eriperent : & Aramus cum eam rem majori conatu moliretur, in medio incendio periit. Hunc cum Pater simulacrorum opifex in Ure Chaldeæ regionis Urbe humasset, inde Carras Mesopotamiæ Urbem commigravit. Eo loci Abrahamo, cum per QUINDECIM ANNOS in familia Patris vixisset, nocte quadam subiit ex hyderum motu insequentiis temporis statum considerare : quippe

56 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

was 60 Years old when he departed from *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, and that he sojourned 15 Years in *Haran*. Now, if there were such Traditions in those Times, is it not highly probable that the LXX Interpreters must likewise have been well acquainted with the same in their Days? And if so; is it not natural to conclude, that when they were telling us by way of Explanation, how many Years *Terah* sojourned after this with *Abraham* in *Haran*, they wrote not *Δεκάτεια πέντε ἔτη*, which is a palpable Mistake, but *Δεκά καὶ πέντε ἔτη*, which is perfectly consistent with the whole Tenor of the History. If any of the Transcribers of *Homer* or *Horace*; of *Tully* or *Demosthenes*, had committed such a Blunder, what Labour and Pains would not some one or more of our most eminent and learned Divines have taken in order to restore their Text to its original Purity!

quippe non mediocriter omnem eam scientiam Patris doctrina atque exercitatione tenenti. Ergo singulis de quibus quærebat consideratis, supervacaneam esse universam istam curiositatem deprehendit: quod Deus pro sua voluntate omnia qua divinatio prædixisset, mutare possit. Itaque hæc & alias id genus res serio atque toto corde repudians, perfectamque Deum colendi pietatem demonstrans, ita est à Deo compellatus: Egrederere ex terra tua, & gente tua, & ex familia tua, &c.

IV. *Remarks*

IV.

Remarks on the Chronology of Josephus for the Second Period.

I have observed above, that *Josephus* was not only well acquainted with, and had a good Opinion of the Version of the *Septuagint*; but that he had it before him, and actually made use of it when he was writing the *Chronology* of the *Antediluvian World*. I shall here endeavour to shew that he has observed the same Conduct with regard to that Period which we have now under Consideration. And,

1. I have taken the *interlineary* Version of *Arias Montanus*; the *Version* of the *Septuagint*; and the Greek of *Josephus*; as I did before; and by comparing the Names of the Persons and Places mentioned in each of them within this Period, with one another; I find that *Sem* in the *Hebrew* is called *Sem*; in the *Sept.* Σήμ; and in *Josephus* Σήμας, with an η and not an ε; That *Arphaxad* in *Hebrew* is called *Arpachšad*; in the *Sept.* Ἀρφαξάδ; and in *Josephus* Ἀρφαξάδης; That *Salah* in *Hebrew* is called *Selach*; in the *Sept.* Σαλα; and in *Josephus* Σαλας; That *Eber* in *Hebrew* is called *Heber*; in the *Sept.* Ἑβρ; and in *Josephus*

phus Ἐβὶρ; That Peleg in Hebrew is called Pelegb; in the Sept. Φαλὲν; and by Josephus Φάλικ; That Reu in Hebrew is called Rebu; in the Sept. Ραυᾶν; and by Josephus Ράγαν; That Serug in Hebrew is called Serugh; in the Sept. Σερὺχ; and in Josephus Σερρυ, (changing the χ into γ, *euphonia gratiâ*;) That Nabor in Hebrew is called Nachor; in the Sept. Ναχωρ; and in Josephus Ναχωρης; with a χ and an ω as the Sept. has it; That Terab in Hebrew is called Terach; in the Sept. Θάρρα; and in Josephus Θάρρ; That Abram, Nabor, and Haran in Hebrew are called Abram Nachor, and Haran; in the Sept. Ἀβραμ, Ναχωρ, and Ἀρράν; and in Josephus Ἀβραμ, Ναχωρης, and Ἀβρων; That Sarab in Hebrew is called Sarai; in the Sept. Σάρα; and in Josephus Σάρρα; That Milcab in Hebrew is called Milcha; in the Sept. Μίλχα; and in Josephus Μίλχα, with an ε as the Sept. have it; That Haran, the Name of a Place, in Hebrew is called Charan; in the Sept. Χαρράν; and in Josephus Χαρράν; That Canaan in Hebrew is called Chenaban; in the Sept. γῆ τῆς Χαναανίων; and in Josephus Χαναανία; That Ur of the Chaldees in Hebrew is called Ur Chasdim; in the Sept. Χώρα τῆς Χαλδαίων; and in Josephus Χαλδαία; That Javan in Hebrew is called Javan; in the Sept. Ἰωάν; and in Josephus

Josephus ἸωυάνⓈ; That *Tubal* in Hebrew is called *Tubal*; in the *Sept.* Θούλ; and in *Josephus* ΘούλⓈ; That *Meshech* in Hebrew is called *Mesech*; in the *Sept.* Μοσάχ; and in *Josephus* ΜόσοχⓈ; That *Tiras* in Hebrew is called *Tiras*; in the *Sept.* Θήρας; and in *Josephus* Θήρας; That *Ashkenaz* in the Hebrew is called *Aschenaz*; in the *Sept.* Ἀχανάζ; and in *Josephus* ἈχανάζⓈ; That *Togarma* in Hebrew is called *Togbarmah*; in the *Sept.* Θογάρμα; and in *Josephus* Θογάρμης; That *Cush* in Hebrew is called *Cbus*; in the *Sept.* Χῦς; and in *Josephus* ΧῦσⓈ; That *Canaan* in Hebrew is called *Chenaban*; in the *Sept.* Χαναάν; and in *Josephus* ΧαναάνⓈ; That *Sebah* in Hebrew is called *Sebai*; in the *Sept.* Σεβὰ; and in *Josephus* Σεβας; That *Havilah* in the Hebrew is called *Chavilah*; in the *Sept.* Ἐὐιλὰ; and in *Josephus* Ἐὐίλας; That *Raamah* in Hebrew is called *Rabamah*; in the *Sept.* Ράμμα; and in *Josephus* ΡάμμⓈ; That *Nimrod* in Hebrew is called *Nimrod*; in the *Sept.* Νεβρώδ; and in *Josephus* Νεβρώδης; That *Sinbar* in Hebrew is called *Sinbar*; in the *Sept.* Σινάαρ; and in *Josephus* Σινάαρ. What need of any more Instances of this Kind? Does it not appear from these, as clear as the Sun at Noon-Day, That *Josephus* had the Version of the *Septuagint* before his Eyes, and that he

60 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

actually made use of it, when he was writing this Part of his Antiquities?

2. By comparing the ten Ages of the Patriarchs between the Flood and the Birth of *Abraham* it appears; 1° That *Cainan*, the third in order in the *Septuagint*, is wholly wanting in all our present Copies of the *Hebrew* and of *Josephus*. 2° That of the other nine Ages in *Josephus*, only one, viz. That of *Terab* when he begat *Abraham*, agrees with the *Hebrew*. 3° That the eight remaining Ages in *Josephus*, differ every one of them from all our present Copies of the *Hebrew*. 4° That of the nine Ages in *Josephus*, seven, viz. That of *Arphaxad*, *Salab*, *Heber*, *Phaleg*, *Reu*, *Serug*, and *Terab*, agree exactly with the *Septuagint*; one small Transposition of two Years in the Ages of *Reu* and *Serug* only excepted; which may very well be ascribed to the Negligence of some one or other of his Transcribers.

3. Since it is certain that *Josephus* approved of the Version of the *Septuagint*, as an exact and faithful Translation of the *Hebrew* Scriptures; since it appears that he had it before him, and that he has actually made use of it in this part of his Antiquities; since he has regulated his *Chronology* before the Flood by the *Chronology* of this Version; and since the
Ages,

Ages, at which he makes *seven* of the Patriarchs after the Flood to beget their Children, agree exactly with the Chronology of the *Septuagint* after the Flood: The Question is, how and by what Rule we are to correct the other two Ages in *Josephus*, viz. That of *Sem* and *Nabor*, which according to all our present Copies differ both from the *Hebrew* and from the *Septuagint*; for that they must be corrected some how or other, is agreed on all hands. Shall we correct them by the present *Hebrew*, which agrees with *Josephus* but in *one only* of all the *nine Ages*? or shall we correct them by the *Septuagint*, with whom *Josephus* agrees in *seven* of the *nine*, that is, in *every one of the other Ages*? Here every Reader is at Liberty to chuse which Side he pleases; but for my own part, I must confess, I cannot but conclude that, he who chose to follow the *Septuagint* in *seven* of those Ages, did most probably follow them in the other *two*; and consequently that according to *Josephus*'s own original Copies, *Sem* begat *Arphaxad* (not 12 but) two Years after the *Flood*; and that *Nabor* begat *Terah* (not at the Age of 120, but) at the Age of 79 Years.

4. Since the Sum of all the *nine Ages* in *Josephus*'s present Copies, amounts unto 993 Years; or more truly, according to the foregoing

62 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

going Corrections to 942 Years; exclusive of the Age of *Cainan*: It follows, that the Preamble to this Part of his Chronology, which says that *Abraham* was born 292 Years after the Flood, must needs be corrupted; but whether it was done by *Accident* or by *Design*, is not now so easy to determine: Tho' I am inclined to think it must have been done by some designing *Jew* or other, soon after *Josephus's* own Time, or at least before *Rufinus's* Version (which agrees herein with all our *Greek* Copies) in order to perplex his Chronology, and consequently to disqualify him from being a Witness for the Truth of the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, in Opposition to that of the then *Hebrew* Copies. But whether this be so or not, I humbly think there can be no doubt, as to the Corruption it self; not only because the Sum of 292 Years is inconsistent with the Sum of the several particular Ages to this Day preserved in *Josephus*; but likewise for the following plain Reasons.

1^o In the third Chapter of the first Book of his Antiquities, He tells that *Noah* lived 350 Years after the Flood, and then died. And in the next Chapter, he further informs us that οἱ δὲ Νῶεω παῖδες τρεῖς ὄντες, Σήμας, καὶ Ιαφίθας, καὶ Χάμας, ἑκατὸν ἑτεσιν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς
ἰπομ-

ἐπομβρίας γεγονότες, ΠΡΩΤΟΙ κατελθόντες ἀπὸ
 τῶν ὄρων εἰς τὰ πεδία, τῶν ἐν ταῖς οἰκησίαις
 ἰσχυρῶς. καὶ τὲς ἄλλες, Ἰφθίμους, δευτέρους, καὶ τὸ
 καλακλυστὸν τὰ πεδία, καὶ ὁκνηρῶς ἔχουσας πρὸς
 τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑψηλῶν τόπων κατέβασαν, ἔπεισαν
 θαρσύναντες μιμηταὶ αὐτῶν γενέσθαι. καὶ τὸ μὲν πεδίον
 εἰς τὸ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ αὐτοὶ κατέβησαν, καλεῖται Σενάαρ.
 i.e. Noëi autem filii tres erant, Semas, Japhetus,
 & Chamus, centum annis ante diluvium nati:
 qui PRIMI de montibus in camporum plani-
 ciem descendentes, illic habitare constituerunt:
 & aliis, qui propter diluvii memoriam cam-
 pestria metuebant, & segnes erant ad descensum
 ex locis celsioribus, faciendum, suaserunt, ut
 fidenti animo eorum exemplum sequerentur.
 Et campus quidem, quo eos primum deduxerant,
 Senaar appellatur *. In English, to this Ef-
 fect: Noab had three Sons, Sem, Ham, and
 Japheth, who were born 100 Years before

* This is very much strengthened by what Syncellus says, *Chronogr.* p. 42. Ed. Par. 1652. Nemo namque a finito sta-
 tim diluvio tyrannidem ullibi arripuisse legitur: SOLUM NOE
 in proprios filios ac reliquos homines tota sua ætate, annis nempe
 post diluvium 350, imperium exercuisse commemorant: filius
 Sem in exigua hominum multitudine regenda patrem excepit resi-
 duis vitæ suæ annis 150; cujus potestatis Hæres Arphaxad filius
 annis 33 homines tenuit: atque ita triplicis eorum post diluvium
 exercitæ in homines tyrannidis 533; atque ab Adamo primo
 parente anni 2775 supputantur. Arphaxad vero temporibus,
 annis antequam imperaret 7, hoc est, communi 2736 anno, qui
 erat vitæ Sem 594; Arphaxad 493; Cainam ab Eusebio omitti
 358; Salah 228; Heber 98; Phalec tandem 4^{to}; filiorum Noe
 nepotes, ne forsan iterum diluvio perirent, veriti, de turri ad
 celos pertingente construenda, noxium sumpserunt consilium:

the Flood: And that these descending FIRST from the Mountains into the Plains agreed to live there; and that they also persuaded others, who had been afraid of the Campaign Country ever since the Deluge, courageously to

ac in terram Sennaar profecti, duce & jam imperium in eos exercente Nembrod filio Chus, filii Cham, filii Noe, cujus regni caput Babylon extitit, ædificium, teste scriptura, adorti sunt: annis siquidem 40, in cæpto ædificio perseverantes, ipso maxime Nembrod ad rebellionem impellente, demum in confusio-nem abducti sunt.—And again, pag. 46. *Neque vero oblivioni tradendum*, says he, *recepto communiter mundi anno 2736, Qui fuit vitæ Sem 594; Arphaxad autem ejus filii 493; & hujus filii Cainan 358; Salab 228; Heber 98; Turrim erigere aggressos, in opere promovendo annis quadraginta perseverasse, ad annum mundi 2776. Hoc enim anno (sc. 2to Phaleci) per orbem universum à Deo dispersi sunt.* To evade the Force of this Argument, F. Le Quien, and many others, would fain persuade us that *Josephus* mentions the Death of *Noah*, before he takes Notice of the Descent of his Sons from the Mountains where the Ark rested; not that *Noah* really died before their Descent; but only because he would give us the History of *Noah's* Life entire, before he entred upon theirs. But had those Gentlemen considered the Account which *Cedrenus* (*Hist. Cnpend.*) has given us of this Affair, I believe they would not have been so positive. For this Author assures us, Not only that *Noah* planted a Vineyard on one of the Mountains of *Armenia*; (ὁ ὄρος Ἀρμένιος ἢ Ἀρμενίας;) but also that he was buried in the same Mountain, (ἐν ἱερῷ τῷ αὐτοῦ ὄρει Ἀρμένιος.) For I cannot but think that *Cedrenus's* Authority is more than sufficient to over-balance the meer Conjectures of any modern Critick whatsoever.—And had the Learned Bp. *Cumberland* duly considered these Authorities, I can scarcely think that his Detestation of Idolatry, great as it was, would have carried him so far as to maintain (upon the Authority of some *Imperfect* and *Incoherent* Fragments of *Antiquity*) That *Ham* was the *Kings* of the Ancient *Phœnicians* and *Egyptians*, and that his Disobedience and Undutifulness came to such a Pitch as to raise a *Rebellion* against his Father *Noah*; and even to draw some of the other two Lines to join with him in the same monstrous Wickedness. See His *Phœnician History*, pag. 264, 265, and elsewhere. Ed. Lond. 1720.

follow

follow their Example. And that the Plain to which they first brought them, was called *Shinar*. Now this agrees perfectly well with the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; and even with that of *Josephus*, admitting that he had really omitted *Cainan*: but can by no means be reconciled to the *Chronology* of our present *Hebrew Bibles*. For, according to the *LXX* and *Josephus*, *Noah* and his Children might have lived 350 Years upon the Mountains; *Sem*, *Ham*, and *Japheth* might, after his Death, come down from the Mountains with their Descendants, and live with them many Years in the Plains of *Shinar*; and after they died, their Posterity might set about building the Tower of *Babel*; the Confusion of Languages might happen; and the Earth might be divided in the Days of *Phaleg*; who was born in the 531st Year after the Flood: but they can by no means be reconciled to the present *Hebrew Chronology*; which allows only 101 Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Phaleg*; and but 292 Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*.

2^o *Josephus* informs us further *, That

* *Antiq. l. 1. c. 7. § 1. p. 21.* Διὰ τὸ τοῦ Φαραὼ ἐν ἡμεῖς μίσητον τὸ ἄλλων ἡγεμονίαν, καὶ τὸ πλεονεξίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦναι, καὶ ἀπασιν σωθήσαντες εἶναι, κατέσταντο καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἔργον. ΠΡΩΤΟΣ δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἀπερρήναλ δήμεργον τὸ ὅλον ἴσα. i. e. *Propter eum*
K ob

66 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

when *Abraham* began to be esteemed wiser than the rest of Mankind, on account of his Virtue; he resolved of himself to innovate or to change the then commonly received Opinion of God into a *better*; and that therefore he was the First (*of his Age*) that dared to assert one God the Creator of all things. Now, upon the Foot of the present *Hebrew* Chronology, *Josephus* could not possibly talk of *Abraham* in this Manner; because upon that Foot, *Noah* died but 17 Years before he was called; and *Sem*, *Arphaxad*, *Salah*, and *Heber* were then still living; who, I suppose, will be allowed to have owned and preached the one true God (as well as *Abraham*) as long as they lived. But, according to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint* and *Josephus*, this might probably have happened; For, *Noah* died 797 Years; *Sem* 645; *Arphaxad* 580; *Salah* 420; and *Heber* 346 Years before the Call of *Abraham*; and in an Interval of so many Years, the World might easily come to be so degenerate, that *Abraham* might be reckoned the *first* (of that Age in which he lived) that dared to revive the primitive Doc-

ob virtutem præ cæteris sapiens haberi cœpisset, vulgo receptam de Deo opinionem innovare & in melius mutare secum statuit. Primus itaque ausus est declarare unum esse Deum rerum omnium episcopum.

trine,

trine, and to assert and maintain *the one God, the Creator of all things.*

3° *Josephus* assures us elsewhere, that *Abraham* was called at the Age of 75 Years; that from the Call to the *Exodus* there passed 430 Years; that from the *Exodus* to the Building of the *Temple*, there passed 592 Years; and consequently to the Reign of *Solomon* 589 Years; and lastly, that *Memphis* in *Egypt* was built more than 1300 Years before the Reign of *Solomon*. All which taken together, is utterly inconsistent with the *Chronology* of our present *Hebrew Bibles*; but is perfectly consistent with that of *Josephus* and the *Septuagint*. For, if, from 1300 Years you deduct the other three Sums $75 + 430 + 589 = 1094$, there will remain 206 Years, which shews that, according to *Josephus*, *Memphis* was built 206 Years before the Birth of *Abraham*. Now this, upon the Foot of the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, which allows 1072 Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*, might very well be. But upon the Foot of the *Chronology* of our present *Hebrew Bibles*, which allows only 292 Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*, cannot possibly be; because it would make *Memphis* to have been built only 86 Years at the latest after the Deluge; and consequently

68 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

15 Years before the Birth of *Phaleg*; in whose Days, and not before, the *Hebrew* makes the first Division of the Earth to have happened.

4° *Josephus* informs us that *Demetrius*, and *Eupolemius*, two *Greek* Historians, wrote the History of the *Jews* with a great deal of Care; and that they did not swerve much from the Truth: Now, since we know from *Eusebius*, that *Demetrius* reckoned 3624 Years from *Adam* to *Jacob's* Descent into *Egypt*; and 1362 Years from the *Flood* to the same time; and consequently 2262 Years from *Adam* to the *Flood*, and 1072 Years from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*; had *Josephus* himself followed the present *Hebrew Chronology*, and reckoned only 292 Years from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*, he could not possibly have said that *Demetrius* in his Chronology differed but little from the Truth; for all the Difference between him and the *Sept.* amounts to no more than 6 Years; whereas the Difference between the present *Hebrew* and him amounts to near 800 Years.

Now for these Reasons, I cannot but conclude that *Josephus* could not consistently with himself, say that the Sum of all the Ages of the *Patriarchs* from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*, amounted unto so small a Number

as 292 Years. I wish I could, with the like Certainty, take upon me to determine; Whether, by leaving out *Cainan*, he made them to amount only to 942 Years; or whether, by inserting *Cainan*, he made them to amount unto 1072 Years.

5. No Man can be more sensible of the Difficulty here than I am. I know that all the Learned, who contend for the absolute Preference of the present *Hebrew Text*, unanimously maintain, That *Josephus* did wholly omit *Cainan*, as not being then to be found in any of the *Hebrew Copies* which they suppose he used. I know likewise that two very Eminent and Learned Advocates for the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, have been much blamed for asserting positively, and without due Proof, That *Cainan* was originally in *Josephus*; but that some bold Critick or other, perhaps some *Masorete Jew*, had laid violent Hands on him, and expunged him from the Text. And I see with some Concern that another Writer, inferior to none for fine Parts and exquisite Learning; and at the same Time a professed Friend to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, is inclined to give up not only *Josephus*, but likewise an inspired Writer, as to this Point. Now since it would but ill become

come a Writer of a low Order, after all that has thus passed upon this Head, among those of the first Rank in Learning, to pretend to determine positively whether *Josephus* did originally insert *Cainan* into his *Antiquities* or not; I shall content myself with barely mentioning what has occurred to me upon this Subject, and submit the whole to the Decision of better Judges than myself. And,

1^o From the Joint-Testimony of all the Copies of the *Septuagint*, I think it cannot be denied, but that *Cainan* was inserted into that Version by the LXX Interpreters themselves, as I have observed before.

2^o From that most valuable Fragment of *Demetrius*, who flourished above 200 Years before our Saviour; and which *Eusebius* * quotes from *Alexander Polyhistor*, I humbly think it appears plainly, That the *Jews* about that Time, had other more particular Accounts relating to the Affairs of the first Ages after the Flood, than what are now to be found in any of our present *Hebrew Bibles*: And among others this in particular, That *Cainan* was reckoned as one of the *Patriarchs* after the Flood. It is true his Name is not

* In *Præp. Evangel. l. 9. c. 21. pag. 425. Ed. Par. 1628.*

particularly

particularly mentioned in this Place by *Demetrius*: Nor are any of the other Patriarchs, either immediately before or after him, particularly mentioned. But since the Number of 1360 ($\alpha\tau\zeta$) or rather 1362 ($\alpha\tau\zeta\varsigma$)

From the Flood to the Birth of <i>A-</i> <i>brabam</i> ; <i>Cainan</i> included	} Years 1072
From the Birth to the Call of <i>A-</i> <i>brabam</i>	} 75
From the Call to <i>Jacob's</i> Descent into <i>Egypt</i>	} 215
Total	1362

Years, which he reckons from the *Flood*, to the Descent of *Jacob* into *Egypt*, cannot be made up without reckoning the 130 Years of *Cainan*, it necessarily follows, That *Cainan* must then have been inserted into those *Memoirs* which *Demetrius* made use of. And whether he made use of the *Septuagint*, or of any other of the *Jewish Memoirs* upon this Occasion, it seems to come all to the same Thing: For if he made use of the *Septuagint*; it shews that *Cainan* was then in that Version, and was universally looked upon as rightly placed therein; but if he made use of any other of the *Jewish Memoirs*, where *Cainan* was inserted (and I am most inclined to think he did) it shews clearly that the *Septuagint* did not forge his Name, as some have most presumptuously imagined; but that they inserted him into their Version, if not from the

the *Hebrew Text*, yet at least from some other of their Ancient and Authentic Records.

3° From the exact Conformity between the Names of the *Patriarchs* from *Adam* to *Abraham*, as we find them recorded in the *Gospel* according to *St. Luke*, and in the Version of the *Septuagint*; it appears that *St. Luke* must have copied them *literally* from the *Septuagint*. And therefore as *Cainan* is there set down as one of the Ancestors of our *blessed Lord* according to the *Flesh*; I think it cannot be denied but that he must then have been in all the Copies of the *Septuagint* likewise; and consequently that he was owned by all the *Jews* of the *Apostolic Age*, as the *third* in the *Patriarchal Line* after the *Flood*. And for these Reasons, I cannot but humbly think that, the most *Reverend* and *Learned* Archbishop *Usher* * was never more mistaken in any Thing, than when he undertook to prove that this *Patriarch* was not inserted into this *Gospel* by *St. Luke* himself †.

4° Since I have proved that *Josephus* had the Version of the *Septuagint* before him, and

* In dissert. de Cainane Arphaxadis filio. Lond. 1655.

† In Cainane vero expungendo prorsus absurdi sunt viri eruditi, plus tribuentes *Judæis* librariis, quam evangelicæ veritati. Improbe sentiunt, cum dicunt *Septuaginta* seniores, *Viros sanctos*, propria libidine *Cainanem* istum addidisse; multo vero improbius, cum *Evangelistam* horum fraude seductum errasse affirmant. I. Voss. de *Æt. Mundi*, c. 6. p. 258.

that

that he actually made use of it, when he was writing the *Chronology* of this very Age; I think it appears that he could not but know that this *Cainan* was mentioned in that Version, as one of the *Patriarchs* after the Flood; and consequently, that he had been owned as such by his own Countrymen, for several Centuries at least, before he wrote his Antiquities.

5° From the Want or Omission of *Cainan* in all our present *Manuscripts* and printed Copies of *Josephus*; I think it cannot be certainly infered, That *Josephus* did really and designedly omit to insert him in his proper Place among the other *Patriarchs* after the Flood; and much less that his Name was not then to be found in any of the *Greek* or *Hebrew* Copies of the *Scriptures*. To illustrate this by one or two parallel Instances: We read in the *Hebrew* that *Javan* had four Sons; viz. *Elisab*, *Tharsis*, *Chetthim*, and *Dodanim*: And in the *Septuagint*, these four Sons are called 'Ελισά, Θάρσις, Κήτιοι, and 'Ρόδιοι: But in all our present Copies of *Josephus*, *Javan* is said to have had but three Sons, viz. 'Ελισας, Θάρσος, and Χεθίμ or Κίτι; and the fourth, viz. *Dodanim* or 'Ρόδιοι, is wholly omitted. Now give me leave to ask; Will any one say, That, because *Dodanim* is not

L now

74 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

now to be found in *Josephus*, he was likewise wanting in the *Hebrew* or in the *Septuagint* in his Time? Or, will they say that, though *Dodanim* was then both in the *Hebrew* and in the *Septuagint*, yet that all this notwithstanding, *Josephus* wilfully and designedly omitted to insert him into his *Antiquities*? Or lastly, shall we say that, most probably, *Josephus* did insert the Name of *Dodanim* into his *Antiquities* in its proper Place; but that it has since been dropt by Mistake, or expunged by Design? If I might be allowed to answer for myself, I would chuse to acquiesce in the last of these Solutions: And if this Reasoning holds good here, with Regard to *Dodanim*; I would be glad to be informed, why it may not likewise be allowed to hold good with Respect to *Cainan*?

6° All our Copies of the Scriptures, the *Septuagint* as well as the *Hebrew*, unanimously agree that *Thola* judged *Israel* 23 Years; but *Thola* is not now to be found in any of our Copies of *Josephus*; though it is certain that he must have been reckoned as one of them by *Josephus* himself. For, the 5th Book of his *Antiquities* contains the History of 476 Years, as we learn from the Inscription prefixed to the same. And that this Number has not been corrupted, is evident beyond all Contradiction

tradiction from several other Places of the same Work. In the 7th Book of his *Antiquities* * he reckons from the Entrance of *Joshuab* into *Canaan* to *David*'s taking *Jerusalem* 515 Years; from which taking the 32 Years of *Samuel* and *Saul*, being the Number prefixed to the 6th Book, and the 7 Years that *David* reigned in *Hebron*, in all 39 Years; there remains 476 Years for the Contents of the 5th Book. In the 8th Book of his *Antiquities* † he reckons from the *Exodus* to the *Building of the Temple* 592 Years; from which taking the 40 Years in the *Wilderness*, the 32 Years of *Saul* and *Samuel*, the 40 Years of *David*, and the first 4 Years of *Solomon*, in all 116 Years; there remains as before, 476 Years for the Contents of the 5th Book of his *Antiquities*. In the same Place of the 8th Book of his *Antiquities* he tells us, that the Temple was built 1022 Years after the Call of *Abraham*; from which taking the 430 Years from the Call to the *Exodus*, the 40 Years in the *Wilderness*, the 32 Years of *Samuel* and *Saul*, the 40 Years of *David*, and the first 4 Years of *Solomon*, in all 546 Years; there will again remain for the Contents of the 5th Book 476 Years as before. In the 10th

* cap. 3. pag. 287.

† cap. 3. pag. 341.

76 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

Book of his *Antiquities* * he tells us that the first Temple was burnt 470 Years 6 Months and 10 Days after it was built, and 1062 Years 6 Months and 10 Days after the *Exodus*; now, if from 1062 Years 6 Months and 10 Days you take 470 Years 6 Months and 10 Days; the 40 Years in the Wilderness, the 32 Years of *Samuel* and *Saul*, and the 44 Years of *David* and *Solomon*, in all 586 Years 6 Months and 10 Days; there will still remain 476 Years for the Contents of the 5th Book of the *Antiquities*. And in Conformity to these Numbers, *Clemens Alexandrinus* † likewise informs us, that in his Time *Josephus* reckoned from *Moses* to *David* 588 (ϥπη, not ϥπς as in our printed Copies) Years; from which taking the 40 Years of *Moses* in the Wilderness, the 32 Years of *Samuel* and *Saul*, and the 40 Years of *David*, in all 112 Years; there remains as before 476 Years from the Death of *Moses* to the Death of *Heli*, which concludes the 5th Book of the *Antiquities*. Now since it thus evidently appears from *Josephus* himself, that the 5th Book of his *Antiquities* contains the History of 476 Years; and since it further appears from the several Particulars recorded in the same 5th Book,

* cap. 8. pag. 449.

† Strom. l. 1. pag. 409. Ed. Ox. 1715.

That

That *Josephus* agrees exactly both with the *Hebrew* and the *Septuagint*, as to the Years of all and every of the other *Judges*, and also as to the Years of the several *Servitudes*; except only as to *Tbola*, who is not so much as mentioned in any of our present Copies of *Josephus*, and in the Years that *Abdon* judged *Israel*, which are now likewise wholly omitted; And since the foregoing Number of 476 Years, can be made up no other Way, but by taking in the 23 Years that *Tbola* judged *Israel*, and also the 8 Years of *Abdon*; Is it not evident to a Demonstration, that, although neither *Tbola* nor the Number of Years that he ruled, nor yet the Years of *Abdon* are now to be found in any of our present Copies of *Josephus*, yet that they must have been inserted by him at first in their proper Places in the 5th Book of his *Antiquities*? And if so; Is it to be wondered, That they who could drop *Dodanim* the 4th Son of *Javan* as beforementioned; That they who could leave out *Tbola*, who by the Confession of the *Hebrew* as well as of the *Septuagint*, judged *Israel* 23 Years; That they who could omit to set down the Years that *Abdon* exercised the same Power and Authority over the *Israelites*; I say, Is it to be wondered that they who could be guilty of such gross Omissions in the 5th Book,

even

even where the *Hebrew* Text itself agrees with the *Septuagint*, should likewise have casually dropped, or even designedly omitted *Cainan* in the first Book with the 130 Years ascribed to him, when possibly they had the *Hebrew* Text to countenance them therein? Might it not so happen, that, although *Cainan* is not now to be found in any of our present Copies of *Josephus*, yet that he might nevertheless have been inserted at first among the rest of the *Postdiluvian Patriarchs* by *Josephus* himself? May we not reasonably conclude, that he, who copied the *Names* and *Ages* of all the other *Patriarchs* both before and after the Flood from the *Sept.* must likewise in all Probability have copied from them and inserted into its proper Place the Name and Age of the 2^d *Cainan*?

7^o *Josephus* assures us that *Abraham* was the *Tenth* from *Noah*, δέκατ' ἔτι Νωεῖς. Now, I apprehend that the Meaning of these Words is not that *Abraham* was the *Tenth* in lineal Descent from *Noah*, but only the *Tenth Patriarch* that was born after the Flood of *Noah*: For so *Josephus* himself, if I mistake not, explains the Phrase a little after from *Berosus**, μὴδ' ἔτι καὶ α-

* And so the learned *J. Vossius* likewise understands *Berosus*'s Words; Cainanem istum agnovit quoque *Berosus*, cum *Abrahamum* decimum esse scribat eorum, qui post Diluvium nati sunt, ut est apud *Josephum*, l. 1. c. 7. *De act. Mundi*, c. 6. p. 259. See also his Answer to *Hornius*, c. 4. p. 318. Locum *Berosi*, cum

πλυσμὲν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ, says he from *Berosus*, ὃς δὲ Χαλδαίοις τις τῶ δίκαιου Ἀνὴρ καὶ μέγας, καὶ τὰ ἔργα ἐμπειροῦ *. i. e. *decima post diluvium generatione, apud Chaldaeos vir exstitit justus & eximius, Rerumque Cælestium peritus*. Now, since it is certain that *Noah* and *Sem* were both born many Years before the Flood, and also that both of them lived many Years after it; I own, I can see no more Reason to reckon *Sem* as one of the *Generations* after the Flood, than there is to reckon *Noah* one of them, which yet I believe no Man ever did. Now, since *Sem* † cannot be reckoned as one

dum dicit *Abrahamum* δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ post Diluvium fuisse, male interpretaris, cum dicis Initium sumendum à *Semo*, ita ut ille primam faciat γενεάν. Atque *Semus* toto ante Diluvium seculo natus est. Profecto nescis quid sit γενεά: est nempe γενεά spatium quod duas sibi invicem succedentes interjacet Nativitates. *Prima* itaque γενεά post Diluvium, continet spatium, quod Nativitatem *Arphaxat* & *Cainanis* intercedit. Tempus quod à *Cainane* nato, usque ad natales *Salæ* effluxit, *secunda* est γενεά. *Decimam* itaque γενεάν sive ætatem, efficit intervallum à *Thara* nato usque ad *Abrahamum*.

* Note *Eusebius* has the same Passage verbatim, *Præp. Evang.* l. 9. c. 16. pag. 417. *Ed. Par.* 1628. But as for his Quotation from *Eupolemus*, *ib.* p. 418. it is so confused that I know not what to make of it: Nor has *Valesius* in his Notes upon the Place thought fit to clear up the Obscurity, or rather Inconsistency with which it is now attended.

† With this agrees *Zonaras*, who generally follows *Josephus*, and who reckons *Arphaxad* the first, *Cainan* the second, *Salah* the third, &c. and *Abraham* the Tenth from the Flood. *Annal.* l. 1. p. 21, 22. *Ed. Par.* 1686. His Words according to the Latin Version are, *Semo de Noe filio quinque nati filii, sumpto ab Euphrate initio, Asiam usque ad Indicum Oceanum incoluerunt. Elam Elymaeos Persarum majores reliquit. Assur Urbem Ninum condidit, & populum suum Assyrios vocavit. Arphaxad Chaldaeorum*

of the Ten Generations after the Flood; and since the said Ten Generations cannot be made out any other Way, but by admitting of *Cainan*

Chaldeorum fuit Autor. *Aram* eos qui post *Syri* nominati sunt, *Arameos* à se vocavit. *Lud* *Ludos* dixit, qui post *Lydi* sunt appellati. — Then he proceeds, and gives us the following more particular Account of the *Chaldeans* from whom *Abraham* descended, viz. *Arphaxadi* filius fuit *Cainane*, *Cainanis* Sala. Is *Eberis* Pater. *Eber* *Phalecum* genuit, ob terræ divisionem sic appellatum. — *Phaleci* filius fuit *Ragab*, *Ragab* autem Pater *Seruchi*. Is *Nachorum* genuit; *Nachorus* *Tbaram*; *Tbarab* *Abrahamum*. Gentis porro *Hebræorum* Autor & Patriarcha suæ Nationis magnus iste *Abrahamus* extitit, Genere *Chaldæus*, à *Noe* decimus. Annis 292 ex quo *Deus* terram universam undis demerserat. From which Words what can be more evident than this, That wheresoever *Abraham* is reckoned as the Tenth, it is not strictly speaking from *Noah* or *Sem*, but from *Arphaxad* the Founder of the *Chaldean* State? And as *Zonaras* seems to have copied this from *Josephus*, Is it not highly probable, that *Josephus* must have had *Cainan* originally in his Text as well as the *Sept.* and consequently that the Number 292 must likewise be wrong, and only foisted into *Josephus* since, and from him copied by *Zonaras* and others?

Epiphanius likewise is exprels to the same Purpose: For he reckons 10 Generations from *Adam* to *Noah*; from *Noah* to *Abraham* 10 Generations; and from *Abraham* to *David* 14 Generations; with this Difference only, that to make up the 10 intermediate Generations between *Noah* and *Abraham*, both *Sem* and *Cainan* must be reckoned; whereas in reckoning the Generations after the Flood, from the first founder of the *Chaldean* Monarchy, *Sem* is out of the Question, and *Abraham* is indeed the Tenth in lineal Descent from *Arphaxad*. Vid. *Epiphan. Epistol. ad Joban. Episcop. Hierosolym. in Oper. Tom. 2. pag. 316. Ed. Par. 1622.* His Words according to *St. Jerom* are; *Rursumque in decima Generatione post Annos bis mille ducentos sexaginta duos, vindicans Deus Imaginem suam, & ostendens quod Gratia, quam dedisset hominibus, perseveraret in eis, ait: Ne comederitis carnem in sanguine: — nec non post alteras decem Generationes usque ad Abraham, & ab Abraham usque ad David alias Generationes quatuordecim, quæ Generationes viginti quatuor simul faciunt, Annos bis mille, centum decem & septem, Spiritus Sanctus loquitur &c.*

as one of them; Does it not follow that *Josephus* could not, consistently with himself, avoid inserting the Name and Age of *Cainan* among the other Patriarchs of this Period?

8^o and lastly, This Testimony of *Berosus* * will appear still more considerable, if we observe that he reckons *Abraham*, not the *Tenth Generation* (in general Terms) from *Noah* or from the *Flood*; but the *Tenth Generation* *ἡ 10^η Χαλδαίων* post diluvium, i. e. the *Tenth Generation among the Chaldeans after the Flood*; or in other Words, the *Tenth Generation from the Foundation of the Chaldean State*. Now, it is certain, and allowed on all Hands, That upon the *Division of the Earth*, *Chaldaea* fell to *Arphaxad's* Share, and that he was the *Founder and first Prince* of that *Monarchy*; and therefore, since it is likewise certain that *Abraham* could not be the *Tenth Generation* from the *Foundation of that State*,

* Agreeable to which *Eupolemus* (*apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* l. 9. c. 17. p. 418.) writes, That *Babylon* was first built by those that were saved from the Deluge; That they were called Giants; That they built that Tower which all History speaks of; and That upon the Fall of that same Tower, by an Act of divine Power, those Giants were dispersed over all the Earth; And then he immediately subjoins, *διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην* &c. that is, as I think the Words naturally import, That *Abraham* flourished in the Tenth Generation after the *Dispersion* (which *Eupolemus* had mentioned but just before,) or in the *Tenth Generation* from the first Establishment of the *Chaldean Monarchy* by *Arphaxad*, the Son of *Sem* and Grandson of *Noah*, immediately after the general Dispersion from *Babylon* took place.

82 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

without admitting of *Cainan* between *Arphaxad* the first Founder thereof, and *Salah*; I submit it, whether this Testimony from *Berosus*, is not a Testimony in point in Favour of the 2^d *Cainan*; and consequently, whether we may not reasonably conclude, that *Josephus* must likewise necessarily have reckoned him as one of *Abraham's Progenitors* *.

Now, these Things considered, may we not fairly conclude upon the whole, that *Josephus* agreed in all Points with the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; and that from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*, he reckoned 1072 Years as they do? These Considerations, I confess, represent the Matter in such a Light to me, that I cannot help concluding that the *second Cainan* must have been either *casually dropt* or *designedly expunged* out of *Josephus*; but whether they will have the same Effect with more competent Judges, Time only can determine.

* The Words of a late learned Writer are very apposite to this Purpose; Cette opinion est celle d'Eupoleme, de Berosé, & de Joseph, quoique des Sçavans ayent soutenus le contraire; mais comment trouveront ils les dix generations que Eupoleme et Berosé compte depuis le deluge & qui commencent à *Arphaxad*, & finissent à *Abraham*, si ils ne admettent le 2^d *Cainan*? Michel, *System Chronologique*, pag. 12. Ed. Toul. 1733.

S E C T. IV.

That the Chronology of the Septuagint for the the two foregoing Periods, is preferable to that of our present Hebrew Copies.

FOrasmuch as it now appears That the Chronology of *Josephus* for the two first Periods, is nothing but a Transcript from that of the *Septuagint*; And since the Chronology of the *Samaritan* Copies differs so widely from that of the *Hebrew* after the Flood, and from that of the *Septuagint* before it, and consequently is of such a motley Nature, that no great Stress can be laid on it either Way: The next Thing that naturally offers itself, is to consider, to which of the two principal Systems of Chronology we ought to give the Preference; to That of our present *Hebrew* Copies? or to That of the *Septuagint*?

Now, saving to the *Holy Scriptures* in their original Purity, all the Veneration and Respect which is due to them as the *Oracles* of God, and as a Rule of Faith and Practice most wisely suited to all States and Degrees of Men, and on those Accounts infinitely superior to all human Compositions; I shall here take the Liberty to consider them *only in*

84 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

a literal and historical Sense. And since it cannot be said with any Colour of Reason, that we have now at this Time any better or greater Assurance that our present *Hebrew* Copies are in all Points conformable to those which the *Jews* themselves made use of in the Days of *Eleazar*; than we have that our present Copies of the *Septuagint* are in all Points conformable to the original Version, which was made by some of the most learned of the *Jews* themselves, from the same *Hebrew* Scriptures, which were in use among the same People, in the Days of the same High Priest; I shall likewise here take the Liberty to consider the Differences between our present *Hebrew* Copies and the *Septuagint*, with Regard to the Point before us, as so many various Readings of the original *Hebrew* Text itself. To explain this a little more particularly; Could any one produce the original *Hebrew* Text, as it stood in the Days of *Eleazar* the High Priest, before any Version whatsoever was made from it; and could such a Person upon sure Grounds be able to say, this is the very Text, and so and so it was read and understood in those Days, and not otherwise; I say, could any Person do this, it would without all Controversy enable us to compare our present *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies of the Scriptures

Scriptures with that original Standard, and we should then see which of the two agreed best with, or came nearest to the same; and consequently we should be able to judge which of them ought in Justice to be preferred to the other. But since this is now impossible to be done, all those old and uncorrupt *Hebrew* Copies being long since lost beyond Retrieve; I say on the other Hand, that we have now no Way left to enable us to judge of the original *Hebrew* Text as it stood in the Days of *Eleazar*, before any Version whatsoever was made from it, but by such *Hebrew* Copies as have since been conveyed down to us from Time to Time by the *Jews* themselves; and by that *Greek* Version of the Scriptures, which was likewise made by some of the most learned of the *Jews* (in the Days of the same High Priest) from the same original Standard; and which they likewise conveyed down to us as a true and perfect Version of the said original *Hebrew* Text. And since the Case really stands thus; I own I can see no Reason why our present *Hebrew* Copies, as *such*, should claim any Preference to our present *Greek* Copies of the Scriptures: And therefore I cannot but think, that we may without any Prejudice to the divine Authority of the *Hebrew* Text, as it stood in the Days of *Eleazar*;

86 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

zar, take the Liberty to compare our present *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies with one another; and, wheresoever they differ, to give the Preference to that Reading, which, upon due Consideration, appears to be the most rational and probable of the two.

These Things being premised, I humbly think it will be no difficult Matter to make it appear, That in Point of Probability, the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint* for the two foregoing Periods, is, as I may say, infinitely preferable to that of our present *Hebrew* Copies. For,

I. We have certain Proof, That, many Years before the Birth of our blessed Saviour, some of the *Jews* at least, computed the Length of these two Periods, according to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*. But I have not yet met with any Shadow of Proof, to shew that any of them before our Saviour's Time, ever computed the Length of these two Periods by the *Chronology* of any of our present *Hebrew* Copies. *Demetrius** the Historian, who flourished but about 70 Years after the Version of the *Septuagint* was made, and who certainly had the Perusal of some of the *Jewish* Memoirs, if not of that Version itself, computed from the *Creation* of

* Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 9. c. 21,

the World to *Jacob's* Descent into *Egypt* 3624 Years; and from the Flood to the same Time 1362 Years; and from the Call of *Abraham* 215 Years to the same Time. Now, if from 1362 Years we deduct 215, the Remainder, viz. 1147 shews the Number of Years from the *Flood* to the Call of *Abraham*; and if from 1147 Years we deduct 75 the Age of *Abraham* when he was called, the Remainder, viz. 1072 Years shews the Number of Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*; which agrees exactly with the Chronology of the *Septuagint*. Again, If from 3624 Years, we deduct 1362 Years, the Remainder, viz. 2262 Years shews the Number of Years which he computed from the *Creation* to the *Flood*; and herein he differs from the best Copies of the *Septuagint* but six Years; which I take to arise from a Mistake, which had crept very early into some Copies of the *Septuagint*, by making *Lamech* to beget *Noah* at the Age of 188 instead of 182 Years. Here we have a Demonstration, that long before the Birth of our blessed Lord, some *Jews* at least computed the Years from the *Creation* to the *Flood*, and from thence to the Birth of *Abraham*, according to the *Chronology* of our present Copies of the *Septuagint*. Let those, who take the other Side
of

of the Question, produce an Instance like this, if they can, to shew that any of the *Jews* before our Saviour's Days, computed the Length of the two Periods we are now speaking of, by the Chronology of any of our present *Hebrew* Copies.

2. Next comes the noble *Jewish* Historian, who wrote the Antiquities of his Nation, in the Reign of *Domitian*, and only about 93 Years after the *Birth* of our blessed Lord, reckoning from the vulgar *Æra*. In this admired Work he traces the Origin of the *Jews* from *Adam*, through a long Succession of more than 5000 Years, to his own Time: And to enable him to do this the more accurately, we are sure that he had before his Eyes, not only the Version of the *Septuagint*, but likewise That most Authentic *Hebrew* Copy of the sacred Books, which was found in the Temple, when it was destroyed by *Titus*. Now this very Writer, skilled as he was in the sacred Language as well as Learning of his Country (perhaps beyond any of his Contemporaries, and in all Probability much beyond any of the later *Jewish* Writers) we see has preferred the *Chronology* of our present Copies of the *Septuagint* to that of all of our present *Hebrew* Copies. And after this; Can any Man believe, that the Version of the *Septuagint*

tuagint which he then made use of, differed from that *Hebrew* Copy, which he had, by the Favour of *Titus*, out of the *Temple*? Can it be supposed, if there had been any Difference between them at that Time, with Regard to the Chronology of these two Periods; That he would have preferred any *Greek Version* to the *Original Hebrew Copy* itself; till then so carefully preserved among the sacred Records by the most learned of his own Nation? Or, can they, who contend so strenuously for the Chronology of our present *Hebrew* Copies, produce any Proof of equal Credit and Antiquity with this, to shew that any of the *Jews*, for the first hundred Years after the Birth of our Saviour *Christ* and upwards, ever reckoned the Years of the two Periods we have now under Consideration, by any of them? If they can; let me beseech them not to hide them any longer, but to bring them forth to open Light, and thereby to enable me to rectify my present mistaken Notions about this Affair, as soon as I possibly can.

3. Since it is certain, that the Version of the *Septuagint* was made many Years before the Birth of our blessed LORD, by *Jews* themselves, and from the best and most Authentic Copies then in being; and since it may reasonably be presumed, That the *Hebrew* Copies,

N

which

which those Interpreters made use of, were more perfect and freer from Corruptions, than any of those which the *Jews* could have after their State was destroyed, and themselves dispersed among other Nations; and since it may likewise be reasonably presumed, that the true reading of the *Hebrew* Scriptures was better understood and preserved while their Temple and Nation subsisted and flourished, than it could be after the Destruction of the one and the Dispersion of the other; I say, I apprehend that on all these Accounts the Version of the *Septuagint* deserves to be preferred, not only to all other subsequent Versions from the *Hebrew*, but even to all our later *Hebrew* Copies of the Scriptures themselves. And so much for external Evidence, in behalf of the Chronology of the *Septuagint*. Come we next to compare the two Chronologies together, in order to discover more particularly which of them best deserves to be preferred to the other. To begin with the Period before the Flood; I observe,

4. That there does not seem to be that Proportion and Congruity in the *Hebrew*, between the Ages at which the *Patriarchs* before the Flood begat their Sons, as there is in the *Septuagint*. In the *Hebrew*, *Adam* begets *Seth* at the Age of 130; *Seth* begets *Enos*

at

at the Age of 105; The next three beget their Sons at much younger Ages; *Enos* begets *Cainan* at the Age of 90; *Cainan*, *Mahalaleel* at 70; and *Mahalaleel*, *Jared* at 65: Then comes *Jared*, who is made to beget *Enoch* at the Age of 162 Years; which exceeds the Age of *Adam*, when he begat *Seth*. Next comes *Enoch*, who is made to beget *Methuselah* at the Age of 65 Years; which is not half the Age of *Jared* when he begat *Enoch*. And then immediately after *Enoch*, comes *Methuselah*, who is made to beget *Lamech* at the Age of 187 Years; and *Lamech* who begat *Noah* at the Age of 182 Years; both much exceeding the greatest Age at which any of their Ancestors begat their Sons. And in Consequence of this Confusion, it may be observed that the *Hebrew* makes *Adam* to have lived 56 Years with *Lamech*, the eighth Generation lineally descended from himself; and the same in Proportion may be observed as to *Seth*, *Enos*, &c. But all these Incongruities and Improbabilities are wholly avoided in the *Septuagint*; *Adam* begets *Seth* at the Age of 230; *Seth*, *Enos* at the Age of 205; and *Enos*, *Cainan* at the Age of 190 Years; &c. and *Adam* lives to see only four Generations lineally descended from himself;

Seth, Enos, Cainan, and Mahalaleel live to see only five Generations from themselves; and so of the rest in Proportion.

5. Besides the Books of *Moses*, it is very well known that the *Jews*, before our Saviour's Days, had fundry other ancient *Memoirs* and *Traditions*, relating to the Affairs of the *Antediluvian* World, upon which they set a great Value; and which therefore cannot be thought to have contradicted the *Hebrew* Scriptures, as they then stood, in any material Point. Some of these Traditions are still happily preserved to our Days; and they agree perfectly well with the Chronology of our present Copies of the *Septuagint*, but not at all with that of our present *Hebrew* Copies. I have already mentioned one from *Eutychius*, which makes *Seth* to die in the 20th Year of *Enoch*; and *Enos* in the 53^d Year of *Methuselah*; which agrees exactly with our present Copies of the *Septuagint*, but not with any of our present *Hebrew* Copies. And I have cited another from the *Beresith Rabba*, with relation to the Age of *Adam*, when he begat *Seth*; which likewise agrees exactly with our present Copies of the *Septuagint*, but not with any of our present *Hebrew* Copies. And to these I shall here beg leave to add one more from

from the famous Books of *Enoch**; which were of such Authority amongst the *Jeros*, that two of our divinely inspired Writers are supposed not to have disdained to cite some Things from them. In the Book of *Genesis* we read that, when Men began to multiply on the Face of the Earth, and Daughters were born unto them, the Sons of God saw the Daughters of Men that they were fair; and they took them Wives of all which they chose. Here *Moses* does not tell us in what Year of the World this happened: But from the Books of *Enoch*, we are inform'd †;

* *Tertullian* speaks of *Enoch* and of the Books ascribed to him with great Respect: *De Idololatria*, n^o. 15. and *De Cultu faminarum*, l. i. n^o. 3. — *Origen* and others often mention him; — And *St. Austin* is express; *Scripsisse quædam divina Enochum illum septimum ab Adam, negare non possumus*. *De Civit. Dei*, l. 15. c. 23. — And to the same Effect *Cedrenus* in *Histor. Compend* pag. 9. Οὗτος πρῶτος Γράμματα μαθήει καὶ διδάσκει. καὶ οὕτως μὲν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀξιόπιστος, i. e. *Enochus primus didicit ac docuit literas, ac divinorum Arcanorum patefactione dignus est habitus*. And the same Author a little further, pag. 10. tells us, That in the Year of the World 1488, *Enoch* at the Age of 365 Years, was translated into Paradise; which supposing him to have lived 365 Years compleat, agrees with the Chronology of the *Sept.* but not with that of the *Hebrews*. — *Dr. Cumberland* says that *Scaliger* proves this Book to be of Antiquity somewhat before the Apostles Times; but though neither he nor *Scaliger* think it to be *Enoch's*, yet he admits that it contains the Sense of some Jew about *Christ's Time*, who spake agreeably to Opinions of Good Reputation among his Countrymen in that Age, though with fabulous Mixture. See *Cumberland's Phœnician History*, pag. 306. and *Scaliger Not. in Græc. Euseb.* pag. 403 — 406. Ed. Amst. 1658.

† *Synce*l Chronograph. p. 11. Ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρῃ μὲν τῇ Ἀδὰμ
καὶ οὕτως ἀρχαίων οἱ καὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν διακρίσις Ἐγγράφων
τῇ

94 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

That in the 1000th Year of the World; and in the 40th Year of *Jared*; and in the 770th Year of *Seth*, two hundred of *Seth's* Offspring, (called in *Greek* 'Εγγήγοροι *) were seduced, and descended from the Place where they lived, and chose to themselves Wives from among the Daughters of Men; and that they begat on them those Giants, which the Scripture speaks of. Now this Piece of Chronology agrees exactly with the *Septuagint*, but not at all with the *Hebrew*. For, according to all our present *Hebrew* Copies, the 40th Year of *Jared* is concurrent with the 500th Year of the World; and with the 370th Year of *Seth*, But according to the *Septuagint*, the 40th Year of *Jared* is concurrent with the

τὰ χίλιον τὴν κασμογονίαν ἔτη, τισὶ ἀποκατὰ οὐρανὸν τὸ ἱερὸν, αὐτὸ τὴν Σηθ ἐπ' ἀποκατὰ ἰσοδομικῶν, πλανητικῶν κατέσταν, καὶ ἔλκον ἰαυλοῖς γυναικας ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐγένοντο τῶν γιγάντας τῆς ἐποχῆς, ὡς φησὶ ἡ γένεσις. and herewith agrees *Cedrenus Histor. Compend. p. 9.*

* *Sethi* nomen *Restitutionem* notat. Deus quoque idem appellatus est, ob *splendorem faciei*, quem per omnem vitam habuit. Qua gratia etiam *Moses* præditus velata facie cum *Judæis* loquebatur—quadraginta annis.—Idem *Sethus* septem errantibus stellis, *Græci* *Planetas* vocant, nomina imposuit, cælestium conversionum scientiam excogitavit, quam quibus columnis, lapideæ uni, alteri latericiz inscripsit.—Formosus autem admodum fuit, & pulchre ficto corpore, cum ipse, tum & prognati, egregores & Dei filii ob *Sethi* faciei splendorem disii; terramque *Edenis* sublimiorem incoluerunt, vicinique *Paradiso* vitam *Angelorum* vite similem egerunt, usque ad millesimum *Mundi* Annum. Quorum honestam vitæ consuetudinem *Auctor* primus malorum intueri non sustinens, formositate filiarum hominum, id est, *Caini*, eos fauciauit. *Cedren. Histor. Compend. p. 8. Ed. Paris. 1647.*

1000th

1000th Year of the World; and also with the 770th Year of *Seth*; agreeably to the Traditions of *Enoch*. I am not at all concerned to defend the Story in all its Circumstances, as it is related in those Fragments of the Books of *Enoch*, which are come down to our Hands: But this I may venture to say; That had not the Time here specified agreed with the Chronology of the *Hebrew* Scriptures before our Saviour's Days; the *Jews* could not, consistently with themselves, have reported or given the least Credit to any Part of the Story. But, if the Chronology of the *Hebrew* Scriptures, did in those Days agree with this Account, then it follows that they must have been corrupted since; and consequently that the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, which still agrees with it, is far preferable to that of all or any of our present *Hebrew* Copies whatsoever. So much for the Chronology before the Flood. In the next Period, we shall find, if I am not much mistaken, still clearer and more numerous Proofs of Corruptions in the Chronology of our present *Hebrew* Copies. For,

6. If there was little or no Congruity in the *Hebrew*, between the Ages at which the *Patriarchs* before the *Flood* begat their Sons; the Case is much worse here. For, by shortning the Time from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*

96 *Of the CHRONOLOGY*

*Abraham from 1072 to 292 Years, the Hebrew makes Noah, who lived 600 Years before the Flood, to see Ten Generations succeed each other after the Flood, and to live till the 58th Year of Abraham *; it makes Sem to see nine Generations after him successively die, and to live many Years after the Death of Abraham, the 9th Person lineally descended from himself; who yet (as the Learned Dr. Wills observes, and whose Words I here take the Liberty to make use of) died in a good old Age, an old Man, Gen. xxv. 8: It makes Salah outlive Phaleg, Reu, Lamech, Nahor, Terah, and Abraham for six Generations lineally descended from him; and even the last of them lived to be an old Man; And it makes Heber outlive Phaleg, Reu, Lamech, Nachor, Terah, Abraham, and Isaac, seven successive Generations that descended from him; and yet Abraham and Isaac both lived to be old Men, Gen. xxv. 7. and xxxv. 29. Now these*

* Τὴν δὲ ἐν τῇ Σαφρὶν Λογικῇ ἐπιβάλλει νοῦν, ὅτι ἀπὸ
καὶ Ἀβραάμ ἡμετέρας ὁμολογίης, τὴν μὲν ὡς Ἰουδαίος γεγράφω, ἐν ταῖς
ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἐν τῇ Ἀβραάμ χρονίᾳ. — Συναίρει γὰρ αὖ τὸ μὲν
τῶν χρόνων ἐν τῇ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῇ Νοῦ, ὅπερ ἔστι μὴ παραστῆσαι ἱστορίαν,
[Uc.] Synce. Chronogr. p. 89. Textus autem Hebraici, (scilicet
an eminent Arabian Writer) inde patet corruptela, quod à Casu
Adami ad Diluvium putet annos 1556. A Diluvio vero ad Na-
tivitatem Abraham annos 292. At Noë ex omnium consensu
vixit post Diluvium annos 350. Colligitur itaque Noë vita de-
functam fuisse agente Abrahamo annum 58; quod maximum est
etiam absurdum. Chron. Orient. p. 172.

are such manifest Incongruities, and so void of all Probability, that it is amazing that any one should prefer such a System to that of the *Septuagint*, where we meet with none of these Difficulties, and where each of the said *Patriarchs* die in the same Order that they were born; *Noah* before any of his Sons; *Arphaxad* before any of his Descendants; and so on of all the rest without so much as one Exception.

7. It is contrary to all Probability, that the seven first *Patriarchs* after the Flood, who lived upwards of 300 and 400 Years each, should beget their Sons at the Age of 30 Years or thereabouts, as the present *Hebrew* says they did; and yet that the following *Patriarchs*, who did not live half so long, should not beget their first born till double that Age; *Abraham* at 87; *Isaac* at 60; *Jacob* at 85 *. But by the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, these Difficulties are entirely removed: For, there we see that *Arphaxad*, who lived the longest of any after the Flood, begat *Cainan* at the Age of 135 Years; *Cainan* and the next five *Patriarchs* to him begat their Sons at the Age

* This Argument *Syncellus* likewise takes notice of, *Chronogr.* pag. 89. Ἐν τῇ αἰῶνι τῇ αὐτῇ συνιδέειν τὴν αἰῶνα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπογενέσθαι, ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς αὐτῆς ἀπογενέσθαι τὴν αἰῶνα τῶν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ αὐτῶν αὐτῶν. οὕτως οἱ μὲν τῶν Ἀβραάμ ἰσχυρῶς ἀπογενέσθαι, τῶν δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν αὐτῶν ἰσχυρῶς.

98 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

of 130 Years or thereabouts; *Nabor* begat *Terah* at the Age of 79 Years; and *Terah* begat *Abraham* at the Age of 70 Years; &c.

8. According to the Holy Scriptures * the Earth was first divided among the Sons of *Noah*, in the Days of *Peleg*; according to *Josephus* † this happened about the Time of the Birth of that *Patriarch*; and according to others ‖, it fell out in the 4th Year of his Age. As an Introduction to this, we are likewise informed, That the Children of *Noah* found a Plain in the Land of *Shinar*, and that they dwelt there; That in Process of Time, God *once* and *again* ‡ commanded them to disperse themselves from thence, and to go and settle and cultivate the other Parts of the Earth; That, far from complying with such repeated Commands, they associated themselves under *Nimrod*, one of the Grandsons of *Ham*; and formed that impious Design of building a Tower, whose Top should reach unto Heaven; with a View of frustrating the Designs of Providence, in Case God should think fit to bring another Flood upon

* Gen. x. 25,

† Antiq. l. i. c. 6. § 4. p. 20. Ἐκλήθη δὲ Φαλέκ, ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ
† δαΐδαμονος τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν τῆς ἰσχυρίας. i. e. Vocatus est autem Phalecus,
quia circa divisionem habitationum natus fuit.

‖ Syncellus ut supra.

‡ Joseph. Antiq. l. i. c. 4. § 1, 2, 3. p. 15.

the Earth, to punish them for their Disobedience. And this Tower had been 40 * Years in building, when God came down from Heaven, and confounded their Language, and scattered them abroad upon the Face of all the Earth, in or about the Time that *Peleg* was born. Now, all this is so very improbable, if not utterly impossible upon the Foot of the Chronology of our present *Hebrew* Bibles; and on the other Hand, so very easy and natural upon the Foot of that of the *Septuagint* †, that I am almost ashamed to make any Comparison between them. Can it be imagined That, while *Noah*, *Sem*, *Ham*, and

* Syncel. ut supra.

† *Cedrenus* informs us, That *Noah*, in the Year of the World 2572; in the 930th Year of his Age; in the 330th Year after the Flood; and in the 43rd Year of *Shem*, being so ordered by God, divided the Earth amongst his three Sons; That in the Year of the World 2736, (164 Years after the Partition of the Earth by *Noah*) in the 594th Year of *Shem*; in the 493rd Year of *Arphaxad*; in the 358th Year of *Cainan*; and in the 494th Year after the Flood, they began to build the Tower of *Babylon*; That they continued building the same for the Space of 40 Years, to the Year of the World 2776; the 534th Year after the Flood; and consequently to the 4th Year of *Phaleg*; when God confounded their Language, and dispersed them from thence; and lastly, That during these 534 Years, the World was governed religiously by three Persons; viz. by *Noah* 350 Years; by *Shem* 150 Years; and by *Arphaxad* 33 Years; in all 533 Years to the Time of the Dispersion. *Cedren. Histor. Compend. pag. 12--18*. Now, if according to *Cedrenus*, the Flood happened *Anno Mundi* 2242; and *Shem* was born in the 500th Year of *Noah*, these Dates and Facts are perfectly consistent with one another. But can by no Means be reconciled to the Chronology of our present *Hebrew* Copies of the Bible.

Japhet were all living, any of their Posterity should form such a wicked and Romantic Scheme as this; and not only so, but carry it on successfully for 40 long Years together without any Opposition from them, or from any of their other Children? Could *Ham* at at an Interval of only 65 Years after the Flood, have a Grandson grown up to Maturity, and capable of drawing away any Number of his Brethren from their Duty to *Noah*, the common Parent, as well as the supreme Head of all? Nay, if it could be supposed that *Nimrod*, the Grandson of *Ham* was by that Time of Age, and capable of so much Mischief; yet where could he find Hands enough to enable him to set about and carry on such a Work, as the Building of this Tower is represented to have been *? To obviate these and the like Difficulties, I know some are desirous to remove the Beginning of this Work to the Time about which *Peleg* was born;

* Jam vero quis credat turris Babylonicae constructionem, confusionem linguarum, ac dispersionem gentium factam esse vix uno post diluvium elapso seculo? Ex sacris literis manifeste hoc tempus colligitur, inde enim nomen inditum Phalego. Atqui tum forsan necdum tertius Noacho natus erat hæres. Huic difficultati ut nonnulli occurrerent, miram commenti sunt methodum ad multiplicandum brevi spatio genus humanum: Primos namque post diluvium Patriarchas tam secundos fuisse dicunt, ut anno ætatis duodecimo, vel etiam prius liberis gignendis operam dederint. Sed sanè etiam si concedatur eos cucurbitarum instar pullulasse, non tamen efficient, ut hæc computandi ratio non sit prorsus ridicula. *I. Voss. de Æt. Mundi, c. 5. p. 257.*

and

and consequently to put off the Confusion of Languages and the Disperſion that immediately enſued, to the 40th Year of that *Patriarch* *. And by the Help of theſe, and ſome few more equally precarious Suppoſitions, they have attempted to amuſe the World into an Opinion, that there is nothing here, but what may very well be accounted for. But with all due Submiſſion, theſe Gentlemen muſt give me leave to obſerve; That in a Queſtion of this Na-

* See Dr. *Bedford's Scripture Chronology*, l. 2. c. 1. § 12. p. 180. In theſe Tables, ſays the learned Author, I alſo place the Confuſion of Languages and Diſperſion from *Babylon* in the 131^{ſt} Year after the Flood, whereas others place it in the 101^{ſt} Year at the Birth of *Peleg*. My Reaſon not to place it there is, becauſe there being only the three Sons of *Noah*, and there could not be more than three Generations ſprung up from them to people the World; it cannot well be ſuppoſed, that the World could be ſo populous in that ſmall Space of Time, as to inhabit the whole Country from the Place where the Ark landed to *Babylon*, and from thence to be diſperſed into remoter Kingdoms.—And again, l. 2. c. 5. § 1. p. 205. Before we proceed any farther, ſays he, it will be neceſſary to answer two Objections.—The firſt is, That there could not be Men enough ſo ſoon after the Flood to build ſuch a prodigious Tower, as the Tower of *Babel* was.—In Answer to theſe it muſt be owned, That if the Time of the Diſperſion from *Babylon* had been placed at the Birth of *Peleg*, as moſt have placed it, the firſt Objection would have had a much greater Force; but it is very much abated, by placing the Time 30 Years later according to *Beroſus*; neither can there be any Inconvenience in placing it 40 Years after, as upon ſecond Thoughts I have ventured to place it.—Who can encounter ſuch potent Arguments as theſe? Who after this will preſume to diſpute with the Dr. whether *Noah* expelled *Japhet* and *Ham* from the Habitations of *Sem*? Whether, to be revenged on him, they did not join all their Power together, and contrived to build the Tower of *Babel*, the better to annoy thoſe from whom he had expelled them? Whether *Ham* at laſt, did not ſet upon his ancient Father, and drive him into *China*?

tute,

ture, we are not to be governed by any *imaginary Calculations*, how *tedious* or *troublesome* soever; but by *Nature* and *Facts* and *ancient Testimonies*. If they can prove either from *Scripture* or from *Antiquity*, that the Tower of *Babel* was not begun to be built, till about the Time that *Peleg* was born; and that the Confusion of Languages, and the Dispersion did not happen till about the 40th Year of the Life of that *Patriarch*; or, if they can give us any Instance out of all the Nations of the Earth, past or present, whereby it can be made appear that the living Produce (by natural Generation) of any three Couple, has, at any one Time within the Space of 100, or even of 140 Years, amounted unto 100,000 Persons *, not to say, a hundred Millions, I will then admit that there is some Strength in their Arguments. But, if they can defend the Chronology of our present *Hebrew Bibles* no other Way, but upon the Foot of a Number of *meer imaginary* and *precarious Suppositions*; they must hold me excused, if I take the Liberty to prefer the Chronology of that Version, which, with Regard to us, is as authentic, and perhaps more ancient, than the present *Hebrew* itself;

* See *I. Vossius* against *Hornius*, *Castigat.* and *Castigat. Auct.* p. 366—368.

and

and which allows a sufficient Length of Time between the Deluge and the Dispersion, for all the Events which happened therein.

9. It appears from the Book of *Genesis* *, That, in the Days of *Abraham*, the Earth was divided into, and consisted of sundry flourishing States and Kingdoms; the *Assyrians* † were then a great and powerful People; and *Egypt* was governed by Kings, who were called *Pharaohs*. And it appears further from *Josephus* ‖, That *Minæus*, the first of the Race of the *Pharaohs*, built *Memphis* in *Egypt* above 1300 Years before the Reign of *Solomon*. Now *Josephus* himself computes from the Birth of *Abraham* to the *Exodus* 505 Years; and from the *Exodus* to the Beginning of *Solomon's* Reign 589 Years; and these two Sums make together 1094 Years. And if from 1300 you take these 1094 Years; the Remainder shews, That the first of the *Pharaohs* must have built *Memphis* above 206 Years before *Abraham* was born; and the same Author informs us elsewhere ‡, That *Hebron* in the Land of *Canaan*, and *Soban* or *Tanis* ** another City in *Egypt*, were still

* Ch. xii. 13 and 14.

† See *Joseph. Antiq. l. 1. c. 9. p. 24.*

‖ *Antiq. l. 8. c. 6. p. 355.*

‡ *Antiq. l. 1. c. 8. p. 23. Et de Bello Jud. l. 4. c. 9. pag. 1199.*

** Num. ch. xiii. ver. 22.

more

more ancient than *Memphis*. Now, if we should take the *Hebrew Chronology* here for our Guide, which reckons only 292 Years from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*; it would necessarily follow that the *Pharaohs* were established in *Egypt*, and these Cities built, within 86 Years after the *Flood*, and consequently 15 Years at least before the *Dispersion*, supposing the same to have happened at the Birth of *Peleg*; or 55 Years before the Dispersion according to Dr. *Bedford's Hypothesis*. But, if we take the Chronology of the *Septuagint* for our Guide, we stand absolutely clear of these Absurdities: For, if from 1072 Years from the *Flood* to the Birth of *Abraham*, you take the abovementioned 206 Years, there will remain 866 Years; and if from these you take 534, the Number of Years between the *Flood* and the Dispersion, there will remain 332 Years between the Dispersion and the Building of *Memphis*. A sufficient Space, I hope, for *Mizraim*, or some one or other of his Descendants, to remove from the Plains of *Shinar*; to take possession of *Egypt*; to make provision for all the Necessaries and Conveniences of Life in the first Place; and afterwards to apply themselves to Works of Magnificence, such as Building of Cities &c.

10. *Callisthenes* the Philosopher attended *Alexander the Great* in his Wars against the *Perfians*. And as he was an able, learned, and inquisitive Person, and had the best Opportunities that any Man could have to get the best Information about the Antiquities of the Eastern Nations; *Aristotle* recommended it to him to enquire after the Astronomical Observations of the *Babylonians*, and to send him as many of them as he could procure. And in Pursuance hereof *Porphry* assures us *, That *Callisthenes* sent into Greece *Astronomical Observations* made by that People for the Space of 1903 Years; reckoning backwards, as we may suppose, from the Year in which *Alexander* took *Babylon*. Now this Account is very consistent with the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; but is utterly inconsistent with that of our present *Hebrew* Copies of the Bible. For, it is agreed on all Hands, That *Alexander* took *Babylon* in the second Year

* Apud Simplicium, in Comment. in 4 libros Aristotelis de Cælo; l. 2. fol. 123. Ed. Gr. Ald. 1526. — Εἰς αὐτὴν μὲν τῆς τοσαύτης φαινόμενα εἶδεναι ἀλλὰ τὸ μῆκος τὰς ἐπὶ Καλλισθένους ἐν Βαβυλῶνι περιθέραις ἀστρονομίας εἰς τὴν ἑξαίδη, ἢ Ἀριστοτέλους τὸ ἐπισκηνῆσαι αὐτῷ. ὡς τινὲς διηγῶνται ὁ Περφύρας χιλίων ἑτῶν εἶναι ἢ ἐνταυτοῖς τελῶν, μίχρη ἢ ἡμέραν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἢ Μακεδόνος σωσομένης. and *Simplicius* tells us elsewhere (in eodem Commentario, fol. 27.) That the Egyptians had Astronomical Observations of 2000 Years standing at least. "Ἐκείνη δ' ἐστὶν Αἰγυπτίως Ἀστὴρ ἀστρονομίας ἔχον ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, ὅσην ἰσχυροῦσι ἢ διχίλις αἰωνοῖς.

106 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

of the 112th Olympiad, and in the 4383^d Year of the *Julian* Period; that is, according to the *Hebrew* Computation; In *Scaliger* *, *Anno Mundi* 3619; In *Petavius* †, *A. M.* 3653; And in Archbishop *Usher* ‡, *A. M.* 3674. Or, according to the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, which exceeds that of the *Hebrew* 1380 Years; *A. M.* 4999; or *A. M.* 5033; or *A. M.* 5054. Now, if we take the lowest of these last three Numbers, viz. 4999; and if from the same we deduct 2256, the Years before the Flood; and 1903, the Number of Years, to which the oldest of the *Babylonian* Observations, which were sent into *Greece*, reached; in all 4159 Years; the Remainder shews, That, according to the Chronology of the *Septuagint*, the oldest of the said Observations might be made about the 840th Year after the Flood; or about 306 Years after the Dispersion; and consequently that they reached no further back than about 232 Years before the Birth of *Abraham*: All which, as far as I am able to see, is very consonant to Reason, and to the Nature and Circumstances of Things. For, in about 300

* De Emend. Temp. l. 5. pag. 420. Ed. Gen. 1629.

† In Can. Chronol. ad An. P. l. 4383.

‡ Ad Annum Mundi 3674. in Annal. Vet. Test. p. 167. Ed. Gen. 1722.

Years after the Dispersion, the *Babylonians* may very well be supposed to have made such a Progress in Astronomy, as that their Observations might by that Time be worth preserving for the Benefit of Posterity. But, the like can by no means be said, if we reckon upon the Foot of the present *Hebrew Chronology*; because, in that Case, it would follow, that the oldest of the Observations we are now speaking of, must have been made about the 60th, or about the 94th, or at the latest about the 115th Year after the Flood: That is, according to *Scaliger* about 40 Years; or, according to *Petavius*, about 7 Years before the Dispersion; or at the latest, according to *Usher*, about 14 Years after the Dispersion; and consequently, according to all Accounts, before *Babylon* could be built; or at least, before any regular and settled Government could be established in that City.

II. Several other Arguments perhaps might be alledged in Favour of the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*: But I shall only take the Liberty here to mention one more, which is this; the *Primitive Church* every where, we are sure *,

* *Baron. in Appar. ad Annal. Ecclesiast. p. 61, 62. Ed. Antv. 1589.* Illud tamen non omnino prætermittendum videtur, sanctam Dei ecclesiam antiquitus consuevisse supputare annos ab origine Mundi, non secundum Hebraicam editionem, sed secundum septuaginta duos interpretes. Est ejus rei fides apud Sanctum Augustinum, dum de iisdem interpretibus hæc ait: Porro

108 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

computed the Years from the *Beginning* of the *World* to the *Birth* of our *blessed Saviour*, not according to our present *Hebrew Chronology*, but according to that of the *Septuagint*; all the most ancient and learned *Christian Writers* did the same *; *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Hippolytus*, *Julius Africanus*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Lactantius*, *Epiphanius*, *St. Austin*, and even *St. Jerome himself*, &c; The present Church of *Rome*, in her *Martyrology*, still owns and computes by the same Chronology †; and

illos in auctoritatem celebriorem suscepit ecclesia, & credentes, Judæorum potius quam istos non habere quod verum est. Rursum Julianus episcopus Toletanus, hæc in eandem sententiam inquit; ergo illa nobis & sola pro his annis est observanda auctoritas septuaginta interpretum: Quæ merito omnibus editionibus & translationibus antefertur; quam etiam hucusque omnes doctores ecclesiastici tenuerunt, & in hac præcipue annorum supputatione secuti sunt. Adjicimus & Græci hominis insigniter eruditi, de eadem re testimonium, viz. Anastasii Sinaitæ episcopi Antiocheni, æqualis magno nostro Gregorio, qui sic ait: Sciendum est quod aliter computant Hebræi, & aliter Romanæ ecclesiæ traditio. Then follows a List of the Fathers, who compute the Years of the World according to the *Septuagint*.

Syncl. Chronogr. pag. 89. Antiqua igitur Septuaginta interpretum editione, cæ ex incorrupto, ut videtur, Hebraico fonte quondam traducta, per totam hanc chronographiam passim merito sumus usi, cum maxime quæ patet universus terrarum orbis dilatata Christi ecclesia receptam eam habeat, & salvatoris nostri apostolorum ac discipulorum ejus auctoritate usibus nostris à principio fuerit commendata.

Hanc tamen, says *St. Austin de Civit. Dei*, l 18. c. 43. quæ Septuaginta est, tanquam sola esset, sic recepit ecclesia; eaque utuntur Græci populi Christiani, quorum plerique utrum alia sit aliqua, ignorant.

* *Baron. ibid. pag. 62.*

† *Baron. ibid.*

all the Eastern Churches † at this Day; and even the most learned among the *Mahometans* compute the Years of the World in the same Manner. Now, since the Case stands thus; and since it now appears that the present *Hebrew Chronology* stands incumbered with many Difficulties; and that the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, on the other Hand, is embarrassed with none at all; I would humbly beg leave to ask; What Reason can any Member of the *Church of Rome* give, for departing at this Time of Day from one of the most universal and incontestable Traditions which they have to boast of? What Reason can any of the Learned Members of our PROTESTANT Churches give for introducing a Computation altogether unknown to the purest and most primitive Times of Christianity? Do not both Parties here manifestly act contrary to their avowed Principles on other Occasions? Methinks, the late rising and renowned Sect of *Free-thinkers*, the *Glory* as well as the *Growth* of our Age, act more consistently with themselves; who absolutely re-

† *Abr. Ecchellens, in Chron. Orient. p. 174.* Ex hætenus autem enarratis planum fit, editionem LXX interpretum, non solum Christianis Orientis maxime probari, sed ipsis quoque Mahometanis, qui Hebraicam & Samaritanam examinatas, expensas, & cum illâ diligentissime collatas, tanquam corruptas & adulteratas repudiarunt, rejecerunt, atque improbarunt; hanc vero magis veracem, & Chronologiæ consentaneam amplexati sunt.

ject *all Tradition and all Authority*; and who set up their *own dear all-sufficient Judgement, Imagination, or Fancy*, as the *sole and only Rule, Measure, and Standard of all Truth whatsoever!*

I have now taken a short View of the two first Ages of the World, according to the four most famous Systems of Chronology. I have taken the Liberty to offer such Remarks as have occurred to me upon each of them; I have shewn that the *Samaritan Chronology* differs in such essential Points from the *Hebrew* as well as from the *Septuagint*, that no Stress can be laid upon it, in Opposition to either of them: I have proved that the *Chronology* of *Josephus* did originally agree with that of the *Septuagint*; and that the former is nothing but a Transcript from the other. And as the *four grand Systems* are thus reducible to *two*; viz. to that of the *Hebrew*, and that of the *Septuagint*; I have in the last Place endeavoured to shew, That, with Regard to the *two* first Ages of the World, the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint* is on all Accounts preferable to that of our *present Hebrew Bibles*. But as, in the Course of these Enquiries, I have found myself obliged to differ in some Points from sundry very great and learned Men, who have written in Defence of the

Chronology

Chronology of the *Septuagint* before me, and who were much better qualified for such an Undertaking than I dare pretend to ; and as, on the other Hand, those who have laboured to establish the *present Hebrew Chronology*, have started sundry Objections against That of the *Septuagint* ; which, it must be owned, deserve to be thoroughly considered ; I shall accordingly in the next Place take the Liberty to give my Reasons for differing in some Particulars from those who have undertaken the Defence of the *Chronology of the Septuagint* before me ; and then I shall proceed to the Objections of the *latter Class* ; and endeavour to give such Answers to them, as, I hope, may be of some Use towards clearing up the main Points in Question to the Satisfaction of the learned and inquisitive Reader.



P A R T II.

S E C T. I.

If. Vossius's Hypothesis Examined.

THE Learned *Isaac Vossius* * was the first in the last Century, who publicly owned and maintained the Necessity of abandoning all our *modern Systems of Chronology*; and of returning again to that *most ancient System*, which had been in Use for many Ages; first among the *Jews*, and afterwards in the *Christian Church*; and from which the Generality of the Learned for many Years before his Time, had, as he thought, very unadvisedly departed. And so far I think it must be acknowledged to his Honour, That he was certainly in the Right. But, whether he has taken the right Way to convince the learned of the Reasonableness of such a Proceeding, we are now to consider. And in Order thereto, I shall in the first

* In his *Chronologia sacra*, Printed An. 1661. pag. 103--109.

Place take the Liberty to present the Reader with a short View of his Hypothesis, under the following Heads;

1. In Order to restore the *true* and most *ancient Chronology* of the *Jews*, he thinks, we ought to follow, not the *later Rabbins* and their Admirers; but such Writers as flourished either before or about the Time of the last final Destruction of the *City and Temple of Jerusalem*: Such as the *LXX Interpreters*, *Eupolemus*, the two *Philo's*, *Josephus*, &c.

2. He thinks, That an accurate Knowledge of the whole Extent of Time, can scarcely be expected from the sacred Writings; and That most of the other Writers hinted at, treated only of some particular Times and Subjects; and therefore he concludes, That, in an Enquiry of this Nature, we ought chiefly to follow *Josephus*, as being the only Writer that has given us an *intire and compleat History* of the *Jewish Nation* from the *Creation* to his *own Time*.

3. As for the *Chronology* before the *Flood*, he maintains that *Josephus* did originally agree in all Points with the *Septuagint*.

4. With Regard to the *Chronology* after the *Flood*, he asserts that *Josephus* sometimes reckons more Years than the *Septuagint* do. For, whereas we read in the *Septuagint*, That

Sem

Sem begat *Arphaxad* two Years after the *Flood*; he thinks *Josephus* has more rightly placed the Birth of *Arphaxad* twelve Years after the *Flood*: And whereas we read in the *Septuagint*, That *Nabor* begat *Terah* at the Age of 79, or 179 Years; and in the *Hebrew*, That *Nabor* begat *Terah* at the Age of 29 Years; he thinks that the *later Rabbins* have cut off 100 Years from the former Part of the Life of this *Patriarch*, as well as from the Lives of his Predecessors; and consequently he concludes, That *Josephus* did not make *Nabor* beget *Terah* at the Age of 120, but at the Age of 129 Years; and whereas we read likewise in the *Septuagint*, That *Isaac* died at the Age of 180 Years; he thinks *Josephus* was more in the Right, who makes that *Patriarch* to have lived in the whole 185 Years.

5. Though *Cainan* the Son of *Arphaxad* is not now to be met with in any of our present Copies of *Josephus*; yet he maintains that he was inserted there by *Josephus* himself, and that he has been wrongfully expunged since, by some ignorant, or, more probably, by some designing Transcriber.

6. He thinks, That according to *Josephus*, *Terah* begat *Abraham*, not at the Age of 70, but at the Age of 130 Years.

7. The Premises considered; He maintains, That in *Josephus's* original Copies, and before

of the SEPTUAGINT. 115

fore they were any ways corrupted; the true and most ancient *Jewish Chronology* from the *Creation* to the *Flood*, and from the *Flood* to the *Death of Isaac*, stood thus;

	Years	Years
<i>Adam</i> begat <i>Seth</i> at the Age of	230	
<i>Seth</i> begat <i>Enos</i> _____	205	
<i>Enos</i> begat <i>Cainan</i> _____	190	
<i>Cainan</i> begat <i>Mabalaleel</i> _____	170	
<i>Mabalaleel</i> begat <i>Jared</i> _____	165	2256
<i>Jared</i> begat <i>Enoch</i> _____	162	
<i>Enoch</i> begat <i>Methuselah</i> _____	165	
<i>Methuselah</i> begat <i>Lamech</i> _____	187	
<i>Lamech</i> begat <i>Noah</i> _____	182	
The Age of <i>Noah</i> at the Flood	600	
<i>Sem</i> begat <i>Arphaxad</i> , after the Flood	12	
<i>Arphaxad</i> begat <i>Cainan</i> at the Age of	135	
<i>Cainan</i> begat <i>Salah</i> _____	130	
<i>Salah</i> begat <i>Heber</i> _____	130	
<i>Heber</i> begat <i>Peleg</i> _____	134	
<i>Peleg</i> begat <i>Reu</i> _____	130	1477
<i>Reu</i> begat <i>Serug</i> _____	130	
<i>Serug</i> begat <i>Nabor</i> _____	132	
<i>Nabor</i> begat <i>Terah</i> _____	129	
<i>Terah</i> begat <i>Abraham</i> _____	130	
<i>Abraham</i> begat <i>Isaac</i> _____	100	
<i>Isaac</i> lived to the Age of _____	185	
Total		3733

8. Agreeably to this *Hypothesis*, he maintains, That from the *Flood* to the *Birth of Abraham*, there passed, not so few as 292 Years, as our present *Hebrew Copies* have it; nor so few as 1072 Years as the *Septuagint* have it; but 1192 Years; For,

Q 2

If

116 Of the CHRONOLOGY

If from the Number of Years between the Flood }
 and the Death of Isaac, viz. ————— } 1477
 Years

We deduct the Age of Abraham at the Birth }
 of Isaac. ————— } 100
 and the Age at which Isaac died ————— } 185
 in all 285

There will remain for the above Interval 1192

9. And to prove that *Josephus* did really compute the Years of the World from the *Creation* to the Death of *Isaac* in this Manner; he observes that the first Book of the *Jewish Antiquities* begins with the *Creation* of the World, and ends at the Death of *Isaac*; and that according to the Contents prefixed to the same Book in some of the best Manuscript Copies thereof, the Number of Years, of which it contains the History, are expressly said to amount unto 3833, or, rather, according to his Emendation to 3733 Years; which answers exactly to the Sum total of the several particular Ages of the *Patriarchs* from the *Creation* to the Death of *Isaac*, as rectified by himself, and set down in the foregoing 7th Article; and which therefore he looks upon as a firm and undeniable Proof, That he has rightly corrected such of *Josephus's* Numbers as were corrupted, and that

that he has thereby restored his *Chronology*, for the first Ages of the World, to its original Perfection.

10. And since it thus appears that there passed 1192 Years from the *Flood* to the *Birth* of *Abraham*; he thinks, That instead of reading in our present Copies of *Josephus*, That *Abraham* was born, δευτέρῳ δὲ ἔτει καὶ ἐνενηκστῇ πρὸς Δεκαοσίους μὲν τὴν ἀπομυθεῖαν *; we ought to read the Passage thus, δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτει καὶ ἐννηκστῇ πρὸς ἑκατὸν καὶ χαλίδας μὲν τὴν ἀπομυθεῖαν; which makes every Thing plain and easy, and at the same Time perfectly reconciles *Josephus* to himself.

This System seems to have lain dormant, or at least not to have been much minded, till such Time as the learned and most ingenious *Pezron* published his Book, intituled, *Antiquité des Temps rétablie & défendue contre les Juifs & les nouveaux Chronologistes*, Paris 1687: The Design of this Work was to shew, that the present Chronology of the *Septuagint* did certainly agree with that of the *Hebrew Scriptures* before our *B. Saviour's* Days; That the *Jews*, some short Time after the Destruction of their State, corrupted and shortned the *Chronology* of their then

* *Antiq. l. 1. c. 6. § 5. p. 20.*

118 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

Hebrew Bibles, the better to oppose *Christianity*; but that all this notwithstanding, the *Christians* of all *Ages*, *Nations*, and *Denominations*, have ever (till about 200 Years past) embraced and followed the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*. And the more satisfactorily to make out these several Particulars, as I suppose, he has thought fit to espouse and follow the abovementioned System of *Vossius* in every Particular.

The Importance and seeming Novelty of the Subject; and the agreeable Manner in which this learned Writer treats the same, quickly drew the Attention of the Learned; some to Favour, and others to find fault with his Performance. And among the rest, the Learned Fathers *Martianay* and *Le Quien* soon after undertook the Defence of the present *Hebrew Chronology*. But as it would oblige me to draw out this Dissertation to too great a Length, to animadvert upon all that those learned Men have wrote upon this Subject; and as I have already anticipated the chief of their Objections against the *Chronology of the Septuagint*, I shall here content myself with making a few Remarks on the System we have now under Consideration. And,

1. It

I. It appears at first Sight, That according to the *Septuagint*, the Ages at which some of the *Patriarchs* begat their Sons, differ from those at which *Vossius* and *Pezron* make them beget their Sons. Thus the *Septuagint* makes *Sem* to beget *Arphaxad* 2 Years after the Flood; but they make *Sem* beget *Arphaxad* 12 Years after the Flood; The *Septuagint* makes *Nabor* beget *Terah* at the Age of 79 Years; but they make *Nabor* beget *Terah* at the Age of 129 Years; the *Septuagint* makes *Terah* beget *Abraham* at the Age of 70 Years; but they make *Terah* beget *Abraham* at the Age of 130 Years; the *Septuagint* makes *Ijaac* die at the Age of 180 Years; but they make him die at the Age of 185 Years. Now, though I can very readily agree with the learned *Pezron*, for the Main, in what he advances in the first four or five Chapters of his Work in behalf of the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; yet, I must own, when he comes to Particulars, I know not how to excuse his Conduct. The chief Business of his Piece is to defend the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; and while he keeps to generals, he performs his Part to Admiration; but when he comes to compute the Years of the World by the several particular Ages of the *Patriarchs* before and after the Flood, he then abandons
the

the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, and in every Particular follows *Vossius's* System. This is an Inconsistency, which he seems not to have been aware of himself; neither has any of his Adversaries, as far as I know, charged him with it.

2. Though *Vossius* had not observed that the Eastern Copies of the *Septuagint* agree with *Josephus*, in making *Lamech* to beget *Noah* at the Age of 182 Years; yet since the *Hebrew* and the *Samaritan* Copies do both agree with *Josephus* therein; he had some Reason, I own, to warrant his Conjecture, that all our Western Copies of the *Septuagint* are corrupted as to this Particular. But I desire to know what Authority *Vossius* had to make *Sem* beget *Arphaxad* 12 Years after the Flood; contrary to the *Hebrew*; contrary to the *Samaritan*; contrary to all our Copies of the *Septuagint*? Is it not much more likely that the Place has been corrupted in *Josephus*, than that all these should be in the Wrong? What Authority has he for altering the Age of *Nahor* when he begat *Tarah*, from 120 to 129 Years, rather than to 29 according to the *Hebrew*, or to 79 according to the *Samaritan* and the *Septuagint*? Has he any printed Copies, or ancient Manuscripts to support such an Emendation by? No; not one of any
Kind

Kind is pretended. What Authority has he for making *Terah* beget *Abraham* at the Age of 130 Years, contrary to the *Hebrew*, the *Samaritan*, and the *Septuagint*; and contrary to all the most ancient *Systems of Chronology* among the *Jews* as well as in the *Christian Church*? What Reason has he for defending a corrupt Reading in *Josephus*, which makes *Isaac* to die at the Age of 185 Years, contrary to the *Hebrew* and the *Samaritan*; and contrary to all our Copies of the *Septuagint*? Could the learned and excellent *Vossius* make so many *Emendations* in the *Chronology* of *Josephus* without any Reason or Authority? No; that cannot be supposed. Doubtless the Reader by this Time is not a Stranger to his Reasons.—Mr. *Bigot*, a learned and worthy *French Gentleman*, informed him, That in a Manuscript of *Josephus* in the *French King's Library*, he found, that according to the Contents prefixed to the first Book of his *Antiquities*, the same contained the History of 3833 (ϣωλγ) Years. But will this answer *Vossius's* Purpose? Not yet. The Years in some of the old Manuscripts, says *Vossius*, were or *might* be marked thus ϣψλγ; and some careless Transcriber or other, took the second numeral Letter for an ω, and so wrote the Sum ϣωλγ (3833) whereas *Josephus* intended

tended it for a ψ , and consequently meant to tell us thereby, that the first Book of his *Antiquities* contains the History only of ($\gamma\psi\lambda\gamma$) 3733 Years. But how does it appear that the second numeral Letter was ever wrote in any Manuscript, thus ψ ? by meer Conjecture and nothing else. What Authority then has he for this Emendation? Why, admitting the same to be right, the whole Number of Years contained in the first Book of *Josephus's Antiquities*, will then answer exactly to the Sum total of the Ages of the Patriarchs, as they stand corrected above by *Vossius* himself. But is not this arguing in a Circle? Is it not proving *Idem per seipsum*? Besides, Is it not now very well known, that the Number in Question, is not wrote in the *French King's Manuscript* thus, $\gamma\omega\lambda\gamma$; but thus $\Gamma\Omega\Delta\Gamma$; and does not this entirely destroy the pretended Resemblance between the second numeral Letter, and a ψ ?

3. The late most learned and worthy Dr. *Bernard*, some Time Professor of *Astronomy* in *Oxford*, not entirely satisfied, as we may suppose, with the abovementioned Emendations of *Vossius*, has likewise offered several very ingenious Conjectures of his own for the better clearing up this Part of *Josephus's* Chronology.

nology*. But, as he neither wholly embraces, nor wholly rejects *Vossius's* Emendations; and as he produces no other Authority for his own Corrections but mere Conjectures; I doubt, they will no more bear a strict Examination than any of the former. As for Instance, *Vossius*, as we have seen, computes 1192 Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*; and therefore, says *Dr. Bernard*, if from this Sum you reject the 130 Years allotted by *Vossius* to *Cainan*, and the 10 Years which our present Copies of *Josephus* makes *Sem* to have lived after the Flood longer than the *Hebrew* or *Septuagint*, before he begat *Arphaxad*; you will then have the Number of Years between the Flood and the Birth of *Abraham*, according to *Josephus*, viz. 1052 Years; and if to these, you add the Years before the Flood, 2256; the Age of *Abraham*, when he begat *Isaac*, 100; and the Age of *Isaac* at his Death, 185 Years; the Sum total will amount unto 3593 Years; and hence, he imagines that the Number prefixed to the first Book of *Josephus's Antiquities*, should be read, neither Γωλυ, as the Manuscript abovementioned has it; nor Γψλυ as *Vossius* would correct it; but Γφγγ, or 3593 Years;

* See his Notes upon *Joseph. l. 1. c. 6. § 6. p. 33. 34. Ed. Ox. 1700.*

and consequently that whereas we read now in *Josephus* that *Abraham* was born, δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐνενηκὼς πρὸς Ἀκασιόις μὲν τὴν ἐπομβρίαν; he wrote himself, δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτι καὶ πεντηκὼς πρὸς χιλίοις μὲν τὴν ἐπομβρίαν. And if this *Hypothesis* should not be satisfactory, he proposes another, which he thinks will stand the Test better. For, continues he, since the present Numbers in *Josephus* (from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*) amount unto 993 Years; reject the 10 Years overcharged in *Josephus* to *Sem*; and add nine Years to the Age at which he makes *Nabor* to beget *Terah* (*i. e.* instead of 120 put 129) and then the Number of Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* will amount unto 992 Years, in *Greek* thus ϠϠϠ. And since the Number 292 is likewise wrote in *Greek* thus ϠϠ; he thinks that the Transcribers might very easily mistake, and write the last instead of the first; and consequently that instead of reading δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐνενηκὼς πρὸς Ἀκασιόις, we ought to amend the Text in *Josephus* and read it thus δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐνενηκὼς πρὸς ἐνεακασίόις. And to confirm this, he observes further; that if to 992, we add 2256 and 285, the Total will amount unto 3533 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Isaac*; and in that Case, instead of changing the Number

ber prefixed to the first Book of the *Antiquities*, from Γωλγ, to Γψλγ according to *Vossius*; or to Γφγγ according to his last mentioned *Hypothesis*, he thinks we ought to read it Γφλγ or 3533 Years. Lastly, if neither of these *Hypotheses* will do; let us suppose, continues the same most ingenious Writer, That *Abraham* was born in the 170th Year of *Terah*; then, instead of saying that *Abraham* was born δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτει καὶ ἐνενηκὸς πρὸς Ἀλφασίοις, he thinks that we ought to read it δευτέρῳ δ' ἔτει καὶ ἐνενηκὸς πρὸς χιλίοις; and that we ought to read the Number prefixed to the first Book so often mentioned, not Γωλγ, nor Γψλγ, nor Γφγγ, nor Γφλγ, but Γχλγ, or 3633; than which nothing, he concludes, can be more agreeable to *Josephus*, whether we consider the Numbers themselves, or the Shape of the Greek Numeral Letters.

But with all due Submission to better Judges, I think each of these last mentioned *Hypotheses*, are so circumstanced, and so closely allied to that of *Vossius*; that, if his System is true, there can be no Occasion for any of them; and if false, none of them in that Case, can possibly stand upon its own Bottom. I shall therefore humbly submit it to the Learned Reader to determine, whether it

was

126 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

was not too rash an Attempt in *Vossius* * ever to think of restoring the true and most ancient *Chronology* of the *Jews*, by taking any of our present corrupt Copies of *Josephus* for his sole Guide? And whether we have indeed any other Way now left, to enable us to accomplish so desireable a Thing; but by carefully comparing *Josephus's* Numbers with those in the *Septuagint*, which we are sure he had before him, when he wrote his *Antiquities*; and by correcting the Errors which crept into his *Chronology* very early, partly by Inadvertency, and partly perhaps by Design, by the Help of the *Chronology* of that most ancient and authentic *Version*?

* Num ex collatis Manuscriptis restitui nonnihil & emendari queat (*Josephus*) viderint alii, quæ id agere magis quam mihi libet & licet. *Vossius* quidem in *Chronologia Josephi* restituenda & defendenda laboravit: Sed voluit magis quam potuit, & fecit plus quam debuit, dum non raro ex suo ingenio, non ex fide bonorum Manuscriptorum correxit. *Petr. Brinch in Præfat. ad Examen Chron. F. Josephi.*—De *Vossii* autem computatione non est quod magnopere laboremus; cum sit ex ipsius ingenio conjecturisque formata, atque tam à *Josepho* quam à *versione Græca* haud parum abeat. *Id. c. 2. § 2.*

SECT.

S E C T. II.

Dr. Wills's Hypothesis Examined.

DR. *Wills*, in his learned Dissertation † upon the *Chronology* of *Josephus*, advances a *new Hypothesis*. He contends that in the Period *before* the Flood, *Josephus* followed the *Hebrew Chronology*; and that in the next Period after the Flood, he followed the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*. And the Way which he proposes to take in order to demonstrate these two Points is this: “ Since
“ the Copies of *Josephus* have been altered
“ and corrupted, he thinks that the best Method that can be proposed for the Discovery
“ of his *Chronology*, is, to make an exact Collection of such Passages of *Josephus* as were
“ anciently quoted from him within two or
“ three hundred Years after he wrote, and in
“ those Books remain unaltered, together with
“ a diligent Perusal of the other Works of *Josephus*, which being written upon other
“ Subjects, and not containing the History
“ of the Bible, are not so likely to be altered

† Discourse 2^d prefixed to the *English* Edition of *Josephus*, by Sir R. L'Estrange.

“ to

“to comply with either Version.” Now, in Pursuance of this Method, he observes;

1. That *Eusebius* * in his Ecclesiastical History, quotes a large Passage out of *Josephus*’s first Book against *Apion*; which asserts that from the *Beginning* of the World to the *Death* of *Moses* was almost 3000 Years, in these Words, ἔτεσσι χρόνῳ ἀπολείπει τετρακλίων ὀλίγον ἑτῶν; that this Reading is warranted by all our Manuscripts as well as printed Copies; and that *Nicephorus* †, *Bede* ‖, and *Herman-nus Contractus* ‡ read it in their Manuscripts in the same Manner.

2. That *Josephus* in the Preface to his *Antiquities* saith, That the Holy Books of the *Jews* contained the History of 5000 Years.

3. That it appears partly from the Conclusion of his *Antiquities* **, where he saith of his whole History, that it was taken from the *Sacred Writings*; and more fully from the Beginning of his first Book against *Apion* *†, where he saith that *his Books of Antiquities contained the History of 5000 Years*; that he

* l. 3. cap. 10. p. 85. Ed. Par. 1639. from *Jos. Contra Apion*. l. 1. § 8. p. 1333.

† *Hist. Ecclesiast.* l. 1. p. 162.

‖ In his Book *de Ratione Temporum*, pag. and his *Apolo-getic Epistle*, pag.

‡ *Ad Annum Mundi* 2493.

** l. 20. c. 10. § 2. pag. 902. Ed. Ox. 1720.

*† *Scæ.* 1. pag. 1329. Ed. Ox. 1720.

reckoned

reckoned the said 5000 Years from the Beginning of the World to his own Time.

4. That to take away all Doubt, *Josephus* * in three several Places, where all Copies agree, accounts 2000 Years from *Moses* to his Time; as *Philo* † doth likewise.

5. That if we add these 2000 Years from *Moses* to his Time, to the almost 3000 Years from *Adam* to *Moses*, it makes up the Sum of almost 5000 Years from *Adam* to the Time of *Josephus*.

6. That *Origen* || also saith, That from *Adam* to the 70th Year of *Christ's* Oeconomy, was 4900 Years.

7. That it is manifest that *Origen* took this Number from *Josephus*, 1°, Because that Number is widely different from the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint*, but agreeth with *Josephus*; 2°, Because in that same Homily, he twice quotes *the History of the Jews*, and the *Wars of the Jews*, and undoubtedly meant those of *Josephus*; 3°, Because the 70th Year of *Christ's* Oeconomy is the very Time where *Josephus's* Books end. And, to shew that there is no Mistake in that Number of *Origen*, he adds

* *Antiq. l. 1. pag. 3. l. 20. pag. 902. Contra Apion. l. 1. pag. 1333. l. 2. pag. 1384.*

† *Apud Euseb. Præp. Evangel. l. 8. c. 6. pag. 357. Ed. Par.*

|| *Homil. in Matth. xxix. inter Opera Origen. Tom. 2. p. 88—90. Ed. Genebr. Par. 1604.*

130 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

in the same Place, *that it was 4830 Years from Adam to Christ.* And from all these Things laid together, the Doctor thinks it evident that *Josephus* accounted almost 3000 Years from *Adam* to the *Death of Moses*; and almost 5000 Years from *Adam* to his own Time. But this is not all; our learned Author proceeds, and observes;

8. That *Origen* *, in the same Book, takes Notice, that it was as long from *Adam* to *Noah* (*i. e.* the Flood) as from *Moses* to *Christ*.

9. That if with *Origen* we assign 4830 Years from *Adam* to *Christ*; and if according to the *Hebrew* we account 1656 Years to the *Flood*, we shall find just so many Years in *Josephus* from *Moses* to *Christ*.

10. That this may be proved without having Recourse to any of our present Copies of *Josephus*. For, *Clemens Alexandrinus* † quotes *Josephus* from a yet elder Author that flourished under *Antoninus Pius*, as saying, That from *Moses* (*i. e.* from the Coming out of *Egypt*) to *David* was 585 (ϕπϵ) or rather 588 (ϕπη) Years; and from *David* to the 2^d of *Vespasian* 1179 Years; both together 1767 Years. And, if from that Sum, we take the

* *Tract.* 10. in *Matth.* Inter Opera *Origen.* Tom. 2. p. 50—52. Ed. Par. 1604.

† *Strom.* 1. pag. 409. Ed. *Poteri*; (An. 1715) nunc Archiepiscop. Cantuar.

40 Years of *Moses* in the Wilderness, and the 70 Years of *Christ's* Oeconomy, both together 110 Years; there will remain 1657 Years from *Moses's* Death to *Christ's* Birth.

11. That from these several Particulars it appears, That *Origen* took his Chronology from *Josephus*; and that in his Time, *Josephus* before the *Flood* agreed with the present Hebrew.

12. That, if we subtract twice 1656 Years, viz. 3312 from 4830, there will remain for the Space between the *Flood* and the Death of *Moses* 1518 Years, which is very near what we now read for that Period.

13. That putting all these Things together, the Chronology of *Josephus* will be found to stand thus;

	Years
From <i>Adam</i> to the <i>Flood</i>	1656
The <i>Flood</i> to the Death of <i>Moses</i>	1518
The Death of <i>Moses</i> to the Birth of <i>Christ</i>	1656
The Birth of <i>Christ</i> to the 2 ^d of <i>Vespasian</i>	70
Total	4900

So far, our learned and ingenious Author calls in other Writers to his Assistance, pursuant to the Method which he proposed for the Discovery of *Josephus's* Chronology. The next Step that he takes is to shew, what Evidence there is still left in the present Copies

132 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

and Manuscripts of *Josephus*, that he followed the *Hebrew* before the Flood, and the *Greek* after it. And in Order to this he goes on, and observes;

14. That the Period in *Josephus* before the Flood agreeth with the *Hebrew* in the Age of *Lamech's* begetting *Noah*: The *Hebrew* is 182; the *Greek* or LXX 188; the Difference only in the last Figure. And all Copies, Versions, and Manuscripts of *Josephus* have 2 in the last Place according to the *Hebrew*, and not 8 according to the *Greek*.

15. That in the Age, at which *Enoch* begat, the *Hebrew* is 65, the *Greek* 165; and that all the Copies and Manuscripts of *Josephus* here agree with the *Hebrew* against the *Greek* or LXX.

16. That the *Hebrew* accounts to the Flood 1656 Years; the LXX 2242 Years; that there are no Copies of *Josephus* that agree with the LXX, but they have either 2656, or else 1—56, the Number of hundreds being wanting; and that therefore, either Way, we here meet with manifest Footsteps of *Josephus's* Agreement with the *Hebrew*.

17. That *Josephus** saith of this Period, That he transcribed the Years from the Holy

* Here I suppose the Doctor had in his Eye, *Joseph. Antiq.* l. 1. c. 3. § 3.

Books with great Accuracy; That by *Holy Books* he meant the *Hebrew Scriptures*; and that therefore, he copied these Years from the *Hebrew Scriptures* themselves, and not from any *Version* of them.

18. That, as to the Period next after the Flood, the *Greek Copies* of *Josephus* plainly follow the *Septuagint*.

19. That the old *Greek Copy* of *Epiphanius* here certainly followed the *Septuagint*. For, so *Freculphus* about *A. D. 800. in Chron. T. 1. l. 1. c. 35. De numero annorum à diluvio usque ad nativitatem Abrahæ aliter Josephus & LXX interpretes & Eusebius sentiunt, quam in Hebraica veritate continetur.* And he adds afterwards, That the *Hebrew* has 292 Years; the *Septuagint* and *Eusebius* 942 Years; *A quibus Josephus non longe exorbitat.*

20. That *Josephus* saith that *Phaleg* was born at the *Division of Tongues*; but that those that follow the *Hebrew* say, that it was at the Death of *Phaleg*; finding 100 Years too few for the *Peopling* of the World.

21. That they who follow the *Hebrew* make *Sem* to be *Melchisedech*, as being then alive in the Days of *Abraham* according to their *Chronology*; but that *Josephus* saith that he was a *Canaanitish King*; and hath not the least Hint of so strange a Thing, as that
Abraham's

134 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

Abraham's Great-Grand-Father's Great-Grand-Father's Grand-Father Sem should be then alive to bleſs him.

22. That *Jocktan* in *Joſephus*, being elder Brother to *Phaleg*, and having thirteen Sons at the Building of *Babel* that gave Names to Countries; it is impoſſible that *Phaleg* ſhould be born in the 30th Year of *Heber*, but muſt be at leaſt born according to the *Septuagint*, in the 134th Year of his Father.

23. That in this Period of Time, *Joſephus* hath no Intimation that he took his Years from the *Hebrew*, as he had of the Period before the Flood. And from theſe ſeveral Particulars, the Doctor concludes that it is very probable that *Joſephus* followed the *Hebrew* before the Flood, and the *Septuagint* after it. But this is not all; he finds himſelf under a Neceſſity of aſſerting further;

24. That *Joſephus* differed both from the *Hebrew* and the LXX in one Inſtance before the Flood, and from the LXX in one after it; That in the Period before the Flood, he differed from the *Hebrew* and the LXX in the Age of *Jared's* begetting *Enoch*; and inclined to the *Samaritan*, and had 62 inſtead of 162, and thereby made that Number more ſuitable to the reſt; *Joſephus* here making *Jared's* Begetting proportionable to that of his Son
after

after him at 65; his Father at 65; his Grand-Father at 70; and his Great-Grand-Father at 90. And that this was really the Mind of *Josephus*, he thinks may be proved, 1^o, from the adjusting the Particulars to the general Sums before laid down; and making to the *Death of Moses* to be almost 3000 Years; and 2^o, from *Josephus* himself, *Antiq. l. 10. c. 10.* where he tells us that the Temple was destroyed 1957 Years after the *Flood*, and 3513 Years after *Adam*. For taking the first Sum from the second, there remains 1556 Years betwixt *Adam* and the *Flood*; that is, 100 less than our present *Hebrew* Copies make it.

25. Lastly he asserts that in the Period next after the *Flood*, there is no Disagreement of *Josephus* from the LXX, except only in the Age of *Nabor's* begetting *Terah*; and here out of the great Variety * of Num-

* As to the Age of *Nabor*, when he begat *Terah*, there is so great a Variety, that he thinks it hard to discover what to follow. For, says he,

Some Editions of the LXX, as that of <i>Complutum</i> and		} 179
<i>Rome</i> have		
Other Editions of the LXX have only	_____	79
<i>Theophilus</i> ad <i>Autolycum</i>	_____	75
The <i>Hebrew</i>	_____	29
The <i>Samaritan</i>	_____	79
The vulgar <i>Latin</i> and some Copies of <i>Josephus</i> have	_____	28
The usual <i>Greek</i> Copies of <i>Josephus</i>	_____	120
As Corrected by <i>Vossius</i>	_____	129
<i>Freculphus Lexov.</i> read in <i>Josephus</i> some Number	_____	} 79
above	_____	
<i>Origen</i> in the Place above cited	_____	109
		bers

bers which we meet with in different Copies, he thinks the right Number may be discovered thus: Some Copies of the *Septuagint* make *Nabor* beget *Terah* at the Age of 79 Years. And since *Origen* computes from the Flood to the Death of *Moses* 1518 Years, and exclusively of the Year of his Death 1517 Years; and the LXX, (leaving out *Cainan*, as *Josephus* did) account only 1487 Years to that Space; hence he infers that *Origen* read 30 Years more in his Copy of *Josephus*, than the *Septuagint* have, and consequently that instead of making *Nabor* beget *Terah* at the Age of 79 Years, he made him beget his Son at the Age of 109 Years, $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \chi\ \epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\tilde{\omega}$; or rather with a very small Alteration $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \chi\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\tilde{\omega}$, i. e. Anno 29, which is consonant to the *Hebrew*, and agrees exactly with all the other foregoing Observations.

Now, these Things being premised, he concludes that the Chronology of *Josephus*, before and after the Flood, stood originally thus;

<i>Adam</i>	130	<i>Sem</i>	2	To the Promise made	} 75
<i>Setb</i>	105	<i>Arphaxad</i>	135	to <i>Abraham</i>	
<i>Enos</i>	90	<i>Salah</i>	130	To the Coming out of	} 430
<i>Cainan</i>	70	<i>Heber</i>	134	<i>Egypt</i>	
<i>Mabalaleel</i>	65	<i>Phaleg</i>	130	To the Death of <i>Moses</i>	40
<i>Jared</i>	62	<i>Reu</i>	132		
<i>Enoch</i>	65	<i>Serug</i>	130		545
<i>Methuselah</i>	187	<i>Nabor</i>	29		892
<i>Lamech</i>	182	<i>Terah</i>	70		1556
<i>Noah</i>	600				
			892		2993
	1556				

For,

For, all these three Sums added together, amount unto 2993 Years; and so, according to *Josephus* ἔτι ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τετρακλίων ὀλίγον ἐτῶν; i. e. *this Space is but a little short of 3000 Years.*

Remarks on the foregoing System.

The Author of this System, it seems, died before he had put his Papers into Order; so that we owe the Revival of them to Dr. *Hudson*, the Editor of a beautiful Edition of *Josephus* in *Greek* and *Latin*; and the Publication to Sir *Roger L'Estrange* the famous *Translator* of *Æsop's Fables*. But I cannot but conclude from the Learning and excellent Parts which the Author seems to have been endued with, that had he lived long enough himself, he would either have wholly suppressed this Part of his Work, or sent it abroad in some other more perfect Manner. For, surely, as it now stands, no System was ever liable to more Objections. Out of the many which might be mentioned, I shall content myself with particularizing the few which follow.

1. I grant that *Josephus*, in the Preface to his *Antiquities*, saith, That the *Holy Books* of the *Jews* contain the History of 5000 Years.

T

But

But I absolutely deny that he any where reckons the said 5000 Years to extend from the Beginning of the World to his own Time. The Place upon which our Author chiefly depends for this, is in the last Chapter of the last Book of his *Antiquities* *. But they that will take the Pains to consider the Place, will find that no such Conclusion can be drawn from it. He says there indeed, That the Books of his *Antiquities* contain the History of the *Jews* from *Adam* to the 12th Year of *Nero*; and that in them he has given a faithful and accurate Account of what happened to them in *Egypt*, and *Syria*, and *Palæstine*; what Desolations the *Affyrians* and *Babylonians* brought upon them; how the *Persians* and *Macedonians* vexed and oppressed them; and lastly, how the *Romans* made war

* *Joseph. Antiq. l. 20. c. 10. p. 902.* Atque hinc finem dicendi faciam de Antiquitatibus nostris, post quas exorsus sum libros quos de Bello scripsi. Complectuntur autem Antiquitates rerum traditionem à primo homine nato usque ad annum Neronis imperii duodecimum; quæ scilicet nobis *Judei* acciderunt & in *Egypto* & *Syria* & *Palæstina*, & quas clades ab *Affyriis* & *Babyloniis* accepimus, & quibus modis nos vexarunt & attriverunt *Persæ* & *Macedones*, & post eos *Romani*. Atque omnia, ut ego arbitror, executus sum accurate. *Then it immediately follows;* Quin & operam dedi ut observarem summorum pontificum receptionem, quot per bis mille annos extiterunt. Porroque ut reges sibi invicem successerint, absque errore tradidi, quas res illi gesserint, & quomodo rempublicam administrarint insuper narans, ut & Monarcharum potentiam, prout in sacris libris omnia perscripta reperiantur. Id quod facere polliciti sumus statim ab initio historiarum.

upon

upon them. And then he goes on and tells us, how he had taken Care in the Course of the same Work, to preserve the Memory of their High-Priests for the Space of 2000 Years; to shew exactly how their Kings succeeded to one another; what Things they did; and how they governed; and likewise what Power and Authority their Judges exercised over them; all according to the *Holy Books*. But Dr. *Wills* might as well have proved from these Passages, that *Josephus* copied his Account of the Wars of the *Jews* with the *Romans* from the *Holy Books*; as that the twenty Books of his *Antiquities* contain no more but the History of 5000 Years.

2. I grant likewise that according to our present Copies, *Josephus* computes almost 3000 Years from *Adam* to the Death of *Moses*. But I deny that he any where computes 2000 Years from the Death of *Moses* to his own Time. He says indeed that *Moses* was born above 2000 Years before his Time, γέγονε γὰρ πρὸ ἑτῶν διχαλίων; *Natus est etiam Moses ante annos bis mille*. But granting that *Josephus* had really said so, yet still this will no Ways mend the Matter. For, though the Doctor here lays it down as a Principle, that *Josephus* computed 2000 Years from the Death of *Moses* to his own Time; yet we

shall quickly see that he did not continue long in this Mind.

3. I grant also that *Origen* *, in his Explanation of the 15th Verse of the xxivth Chapter of *St. Matthew*, speaks of a Period of 4900 Years: But I must take the Liberty to insist upon it, that he neither names *Josephus* upon this Occasion, nor gives us the least Hint that he borrowed that Number from him. When he talks of the Abomination of Desolation spoken of by *Daniel*, he refers us in one Place to the History of the *Jews* in general; and when he mentions the Calamities that befel that People about the Time that *Jerusalem* was taken, and the *Temple* destroyed by the *Romans*; he says that the Particulars are related (not by any one Author, such as *Josephus*, but) by those who had wrote the History of the *Jews*. *Refertur autem ab his qui Judaicam historiam conscripserunt de illis quæ tunc contigerunt*, &c. Nay, when he comes to compute the Time from the *fifteenth* Year of *Tiberius* to the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, he is so far from naming or having Recourse to *Josephus*, that he expressly quotes and makes use of the Chronicles of *Pblegon* upon that Occasion. So that nothing

* *Traët. 29. in Matth. Opera Origen. Tom. 2. p. 88--90. Ed. Par. 1604.*

can be more out of the Way, than to lay it down as a Principle, That *Josephus* reckoned almost 5000 Years from *Adam* to the Destruction of *Jerusalem*; and that *Origen* in Consequence thereof, took his Period of 4900 Years from him. The Truth is, this seems to be a *Period* purposely contrived by *Origen* himself, in Order to explain the 70 Weeks of *Daniel*. He owns indeed that none, but that Holy Spirit which was in *Daniel*, can rightly and fully comprehend the Meaning of his Words, so as to be able to explain every Thing relating to those Weeks, and to the Abomination of Desolation spoken of by him. But, says he, if we may be allowed to offer a few Things upon this Subject, it would seem as if *Daniel* in the first Place pointed out to us the 70 Years after the Birth of *Christ*: For, in this Week, which is called a Week, because it consists of seven Decads of Years, he confirmed the Covenant with many; when the *Apostles* after his *Ascension* were filled with the *Holy Ghost*, and by that Means acquired a perfect Knowledge of the *Scriptures*; and in the midst of this Week, *Christ*, by the Sacrifice of his own Body, caused all other Sacrifices and Oblations to cease. And in Pursuance of this Notion, and not upon the Authority of *Josephus*, or any other Historian
whatsoever

whatsoever, he makes the 70 Years of *Daniel* to amount unto 70 Times 70 Years, or to 4900 Years. And this Period he afterwards subdivides into seven Weeks, containing 490 Years; 62 Weeks containing 4340 Years; and one Week containing 70 Years. But whatever Notions *Origen* might have about this Affair (which, considering his great and extraordinary Talents, must have been well worth knowing) it is our Misfortune to have the Tract, where we meet with these Hints, conveyed down to us in such a Translation, and in so imperfect and confused a Manner, that we cannot now pretend to find out certainly how he applied those Numbers to the respective Parts of the Prophecy. And therefore, with much less Reason, I think, can any Person pretend to make such a *mystical* Number, the Basis of any System of Chronology.

4. In the next Place, the Doctor asserts that *Origen* maintained, *That there were as many Years from Moses to Christ, as from Adam to Noah*; And for Proof of this he quotes *Origen* upon the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, *Matth. xx. 1—16*. Now, though I have no very great Opinion of Arguments in Chronology drawn wholly from Parables; yet here I must acknowledge, that
had

had we nothing but the old *Latin* Versions to trust to, there would be some Colour for this Assertion: For, in them we read *; *Debet enim esse quædam ratio digna Jesu, quare inter matutinam & tertiam, Tempus modicum est assumptum, & non secundum tempora quæ posita sunt inter tertiam & sextam, vel inter sextam & novam. Post hoc autem quare una sit hora inter nonam & undecimam, quemadmodum superius inter matutinam & tertiam.* And again a little lower †; *Cognovimus ergo intervallum vocatorum circa tertiam & sextam & nonam & undecimam; in qua tantum fuit intervallum à nona Moyſi hora usque ad undecimam, in qua est adventus Christi carnalis, quanta fuit à primâ Adam usque ad tertiam.* But, it happens very fortunately for us, that the original *Greek* of this Discourse is still preserved; and had the Doctor been pleased to have consulted the same, I am persuaded he would not have suffered himself to be mislead by any Translation. In the *Greek* ‡ the first Passage runs thus; *οφείλει γάρ τις λόγος εἶναι ἄξιός τῃς ἰησοῦ εἰς τὸ μὲν τὸ ἑωθινὸν καιρὸν τρεῖς ἰσά διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας τρεῖς*

* *Origen. Oper. Tom. 2. Tract. 10. in Matth. p. 51. Ed. Par. 1604.*

† *Ibid. p. 52.*

‡ *Origen. Oper. Tom. 1. pag. 398. Ed. Huet. Rotbomag. 1668.*

καὶ ἑκτῆς καὶ ἐνάτης ὥρας; καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἑλαττον δι-
 σσημα τ' ὡς τὴν ἐνδεκάτην ἐσώτων, ὅποσον ἦν δι-
 σσημα ὁπὸ τοῦ ἁμα πρῶτον ἐπὶ τὴν τρίτην. i. e. as
Huetius renders the Words; *Aliqua enim sub-*
esse debet ratio Jesu digna propter quam tem-
pus illud quod post matutinam effluxit, tribus
æqualibus intervallis distinctum sit; tertiæ,
nempe, sextæ & nonæ horæ; tum vero dein-
de minus sit intervallum eorum qui circa ho-
ram undecimam stabant, quam quod summum
mane inter & horam tertiam intercessit. The
 other Passage * runs thus in Greek; ἴσα μὲν
 ἐν διαστήμασι τ' ὡς τὴν τρίτην, καὶ ἑκτῇ, καὶ ἐνάτῃ
 κληθέντων. Ἀνάλογον δὲ τῷ ὁπὸ τοῦ Ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ τὴν
 τρίτην ὥραν, τὸ ὁπὸ τοῦ ἐνάτης Μωσίου ὥρας ἐπὶ
 τὴν ἐνδεκάτην τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπιδημίας.
 which *Huetius* translates thus; *Æqualibus sa-*
ne intervallis distant quæ circa tertiam, &
sextam & nonam horam fuerant acciti; idem
autem nonam Moysis horam & undecimam ad-
ventus Christi in carne intervallum dispescit,
quod initium inter & tertiam horam intercessit.
 But in this, I cannot entirely agree with this
 most learned Writer, because he makes the
 last Words of this Passage flatly contradict
 what *Origen*, according to his own Version,
 had before asserted in the former Passage.

* *Origen. Oper. pag. 403.*

And

And therefore, I think, this latter Passage, may be more truly, though perhaps not so elegantly rendered thus; *Intervalla vocatorum circa tertiam, sextam, & nonam horam sunt æqualia. Sed intervallum inter nonam Mosis horam & undecimam adventus Christi in carne, analogiâ tantum respondet illi, quod initium inter & tertiam horam intercessit* *. Now every Body knows that *Analogy* implies *Proportion*, but not *Equality*. And therefore I submit it to the Learned Reader to determine, whether it does not clearly appear from these Passages, that the Doctor has entirely

* Mr. *Whiston* therefore was greatly mistaken, in saying, That the *Greek* of *Origen* in this Place agrees with the *Latin*; and that both make the Interval from *Adam* to *Moses* the same with that from *Moses* to *Christ*. *Essay towards restoring the Text of the Old Testament*, pag. 122. 8vo. 1722. And besides, neither Mr. *Whiston* nor Dr. *Wills* have observed that *Origen*, in this Discourse upon St. *Matthew*, computes the Beginning of the *Mosaic* Dispensation, not from the Death of *Moses*; but from his Miracles in *Egypt*, and the Promulgation of the Law at Mount *Sinai*. Ac vide an primum esse ordinem dicere queas, qui ab *Adamo* simul cum mundi fabricatione initium habuit; exiit enim primo mane pater familias, &, ut ita dicam, *Adamum* & *Evam* conduxit ut pietatis vineam excolerent; secundum autem ordinem, qui à *Noë* & pacto cum eo foedere censetur; tertium, qui ad *Abrahamum* pertinet, cum quo comprehensa quoque esse quæ ad patres ad *Mosem* usque spectant, intelligendum est; quartum autem ad *Mosem*, & quæcunque in *Egypto* peracta sunt, & leges in deserto conditas esse referendum. *Origen*, in *Matth. Vol. I. p. 402. Ed. Huet*. And therefore I would fain know by what Authority Dr. *Wills* and Mr. *Whiston* begin this Period from the Death of *Moses*, contrary to the express Words of *Origen*?

U

mistaken

mistaken and misrepresented *Origen* as to this Point.

5. When the Doctor is to prove, that according to *Josephus*, the Number of Years between *Moses* and *Christ* is equal to the Number of Years from *Adam* to the Flood; he makes use of our present *Hebrew* Copies, which allow 1656 Years from *Adam* to the Flood. But when he comes to prove that according to *Josephus* there passed almost (but not quite) 3000 Years from *Adam* to the Death of *Moses*; he pretends to correct our present *Hebrew* Copies, and to shorten the Period before the Flood by 100 Years, making the same amount unto no more than 1556 Years; and for this he likewise thinks he has the Authority of *Josephus*. But, who can reconcile these Things to one another? I suppose it will not be alledged that *Josephus* himself sometimes reckoned 1656, and sometimes 1556 Years from *Adam* to the Flood; but, if he reckoned 1656 Years, is it not manifest that according to the Doctor's own Account there must have passed more than 3000 Years from *Adam* to the Death of *Moses*? And if he reckoned but 1556 Years; is it not as manifest, that according to the Doctor's Way of reckoning, *Josephus* must have computed many more Years from the Death

Death of *Moses* to the Birth of *Christ*, than he did from *Adam* to the Flood? And therefore take it which Way you will; is it not evident that one Part of this *Hypothesis* is utterly inconsistent with the other?

6. As for the Testimony of *Josephus*, who says, *Antiq. l. 10. c. 10.* that the Temple was destroyed 1957 Years after the Flood, and 3513 Years after *Adam*; from which the Doctor would infer, that, according to him, the Flood happened 1556 Years after the Creation; I answer, that *Josephus* tells us elsewhere, *Antiq. l. 8. c. 3.* that the Temple was built 1440 Years after the Flood, and 3102 Years after *Adam*; which gives 1662 Years from the Creation to the Flood. And I might with as much Reason maintain from this Passage, that *Josephus* reckoned 1662 Years from *Adam* to the Flood; as the Doctor maintains from the other, that he reckoned but 1556. But the Truth is from the great Diversity and Inconsistency that so frequently occur in *Josephus's* Numbers, I can draw no other Conclusion but this, That without carefully comparing all his Numbers together, we can scarcely depend upon any one of them, taken singly and separately by itself.

7. The Doctor asserts that *Josephus* agrees with the *Septuagint* in the Years between the Flood and the Death of *Moses*, but how does he make this appear? Why, he now again supposes that *Josephus* reckoned 1656 Years from *Adam* to the Flood; then he doubles that Number, which makes 3312 Years; and these he subtracts from 4830 Years, and there remains 1518 Years from the Flood to the Death of *Moses*, or exclusive of the Year in which *Moses* died, 1517 Years; and this he says agrees with the Chronology of the *Septuagint*. But he must understand Figures better than I dare pretend to, that can find out this Agreement. The *Septuagint* computes from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham* 1072 Years, and from thence to the Death of *Moses* 545 Years, in all 1617 Years; which, if I can see at all, exceeds the Doctor's Number by 100 Years. And if we should be so complaisant as to allow him to deduct from this Sum, the Age of the 2^d *Cainan* 130 Years; and also to allow that *Nabor* begat *Terah* at the Age of 29 Years, and consequently to deduct 50 Years more on that Account (both which are yet repugnant to all our Copies of the *Septuagint*) in all 180 Years; then there would remain but 1437 Years from the Flood to the Death of *Moses*,

Moses, which falls almost as far short of the Doctor's 1517 Years, as the other exceeds them*.

Shall I after this ask, where the Doctor found that *Origen* computed 30 Years more to this Period than the *Septuagint* do? Or in what Part of his Works it is expressly said, or even so much as obscurely hinted that *Nabor* begat *Terah* at the Age of 29, or at the Age of 109 Years? Lastly, if *Josephus* computed but 1656 Years from the Death of *Moses* to the Birth of *Christ*; shall I ask how the Doctor could, in Order to make up his 5000 Years, lay it down at first as a Principle, that *Josephus* and *Philo* reckoned 2000 Years or upwards from *Moses* to their own Times? But I am really tired with refuting an *Hypothesis* so overcharged with *Inconsistencies* and *Contradictions*; and therefore shall here desist.

* In a Word, according to § 13. the Doctor reckons 1518 Years from the Flood to the Death of *Moses*; but in § 25. he reckons to the same Period but 1437 Years. Now, who can reconcile these Numbers to one another? For, if you chuse the first, then the Number of Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, will exceed 3000 Years, contrary to one of the Doctor's main Principles. And if you chuse the other, then, according to the Doctor's Way of reckoning, who makes the Interval from the Creation to the Flood to be equal to that from the Death of *Moses* to the Birth of *Christ*, each of these Periods would amount unto 1696 Years and a half, which agrees neither with the *Hebrew* nor with the *Samaritan* Chronology.

S E C T. III.

Mr. Whiston's Improvements upon Dr. Wills's Hypothesis considered.

MR. *Whiston*, who loves mightily to deal in out o' th' way Things, has taken a great Deal of Pains to improve Dr. *Wills's* System. He agrees with the Doctor, that, since *Josephus's* present Numbers have been frequently and grossly corrupted, we must of Necessity have Recourse to the Citations made from his Books in early Ages before those Alterations were made, in order to see what was his own genuine Chronology. And he very candidly acknowledges, that no small Part of the Light, which he has gained in this hitherto desperate Problem, has arisen from the Doctor's Observations in the above-mentioned small, but very useful *Dissertation* upon the *Chronology of Josephus*. But then he adds; *That this original Chronology of Josephus differed very much both from the present Hebrew, and from the present Greek Chronologies, and very nearly agreed to that of the Samaritan Pentateuch, is not generally known.* And he thinks that Dr. *Wills* was by no Means able fully to clear up these Points,
by

by Reason of his acquiescing in the common but erroneous *Hypothesis*, that *Josephus* sometimes followed the *Hebrew*, and sometimes the *Greek Chronology*; &c.

Now here, I readily agree with Mr. *Whiston*, that, to suppose that *Josephus* sometimes followed the *Hebrew*, and sometimes the *Greek Chronology*, is a very erroneous *Hypothesis*: And I do likewise acknowledge, That it is not generally known that the *Original Chronology* of *Josephus* differed very much both from the *present Hebrew* and from the *present Greek Chronologies*; and very nearly agreed to that of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*. Let us see then, by what *New Light* Mr. *Whiston* has been enabled to make these great Discoveries.

Dr. *Wills*, as we have seen, sometimes followed the *Hebrew*, and sometimes the *Greek Chronology*. But Mr. *Whiston* thinks that it may be proved that *Josephus* almost always agreed with the *Samaritan Pentateuch*; and consequently that the particular Periods of his *Chronology*, seem, by the best Evidence, to stand thus:

I. From

152 " Of the CHRONOLOGY

1. From the <i>Creation</i> to the <i>Flood</i>	_____	Years 1556
2. From the <i>Flood</i> to the Birth of <i>Arphaxad</i>	_____	Years 2
From <i>Arphaxad</i> to <i>Salah</i>	_____	135
From <i>Salah</i> to <i>Heber</i>	_____	130
From <i>Heber</i> to <i>Peleg</i>	_____	134
From <i>Peleg</i> to <i>Reu</i>	_____	130
From <i>Reu</i> to <i>Serug</i>	_____	132
From <i>Serug</i> to <i>Nabor</i>	_____	130
From <i>Nabor</i> to <i>Terah</i>	_____	29
From <i>Terah</i> to the Birth of <i>Abraham</i>	_____	70
3. From the Birth of <i>Abraham</i> to his Departure out of <i>Haran</i>	_____	892 75
4. From the Departure of <i>Abraham</i> out of <i>Ha-</i> <i>ran</i> to the <i>Exodus</i> out of <i>Egypt</i>	_____	430
5. From the <i>Exodus</i> to the Death of <i>Moses</i>	_____	40
		in all 2993

So far Mr. *Whiston* agrees entirely with Dr. *Wills*: But then he thinks that the Doctor did not take the right Way to prove that this was the genuine Chronology of *Josephus*; by Reason of his acquiescing in the common but erroneous *Hypothesis*, that *Josephus* sometimes followed the *Hebrew*, and sometimes the *Greek Chronology*. Wherefore, in order to set the World right in their Notions about this Affair, and to shew by the best Evidence, as he calls it, that this was the genuine Chronology of that great Historian; Mr. *Whiston* chuses to proceed in this Manner:

1. He

1. He undertakes to demonstrate *That Josephus, the famous Jewish Historian, contemporary with the Apostles of our Saviour, always made use of the Hebrew Copies of the Old Testament, and not of the Septuagint Version, in his Antiquities.*

2. He undertakes to prove, *That the Genuine Chronology of Josephus agreed neither with the present Hebrew, nor with the present Greek; but almost always with that of the Samaritan Pentateuch.*

These Propositions were first published by Mr. Whiston in his *Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament, Anno 1722*; and they appeared to me of so extraordinary a Nature, that I have had the Curiosity to look into his *new Dissertation on the Chronology of Josephus*, prefixed to his late *English Edition* of that Author's Works; to see whether Time and second Thoughts had wrought any Alteration in his Sentiments with Respect to them. But since he has neither thought fit to alter, nor to retract either of them in that Discourse, nor any where else that I know of; I hope the Reader will the more readily excuse me, if I take the Liberty in this Place, to enquire a little more narrowly into the Proofs which he has thought fit to

bring in support of them. To begin with the latter;

I desire to know how it can be proved, *That the Genuine Chronology of Josephus agreed neither with the present Hebrew, nor with the present Greek; but almost always with that of the Samaritan Pentateuch?* To this Mr. *Whiston* answers, "That *Josephus* certainly reckoned almost 3000 Years, and no more, from the Beginning of the World to the Death of *Moses*. This is his express Computation now in all his Manuscripts Greek and Latin: And this Computation is not only in his present Copies, but was also in those very ancient ones made use of by *Eusebius*, who quotes this Passage from him; and whose Manuscripts still appear by *Valesius's* Notes to have the same Number. So that here we may fix our Foot, and securely affirm, That *Josephus*, for certain, originally reckoned almost 3000 Years, and no more, from the Creation till the Death of *Moses*."

But how can the Proposition itself be demonstrated from all this? Why; very easily, thus: The present *Hebrew Chronology* reckons but 2493 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*, which comes so much short of 3000 Years, that, if *Josephus* had followed it, he could

1656

292

75

430

40

2493

could not with any Propriety have said, that it was almost 3000 Years from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses*. Again the *Septuagint* reckons 3873 Years from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses*; which exceeds 3000 Years so much, that, had *Josephus* followed the Chronology of that Version, he could not with any Truth have said, that it was almost 3000 Years from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses*. Lastly, *St. Jerom's Samaritan Pentateuch* reckons 2993 Years from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses*, which is almost 3000 Years, and agrees very nicely with the Number of Years which *Josephus* reckons from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses*; Ergo, *The Genuine Chronology of Josephus* agreed neither with the present Hebrew, nor with the present Greek; but almost always with that of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

2256
1072
75
430
40
3873

1556
892
75
430
40
2993

This is the Substance of Mr. *Whiston's* Demonstration, so far as concerns the two Periods from the *Creation* to the Flood, and from thence to the Death of *Moses*. But, if I understand it right, it is such a Demonstration, as, I believe, few will think fit to depend much upon. For,

X 2

1º, I

1^o, I beg leave to ask; how does it *certainly* appear, That *Josephus* reckoned almost 3000 Years, and no more, from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses*? From these Words in his first Book against *Apion*; ἔτι ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τετραχίλιων ὀλίγον ἔτων. But, may not this Passage, as it now stands in all our Copies, be corrupted? No, says Mr, *Whiston*, that cannot be allowed. And why not? Because *Eusebius* read it the same Way in his Copy of *Josephus*. And was there no Corruptions in *Josephus* before *Eusebius*'s Time? I believe Mr, *Whiston* will hardly venture to say there was not; and if so, is it not very possible that this Demonstration of his, may turn out at last to be no Demonstration at all?

2^o, I have shewn before, That *Josephus* must certainly have had a Copy of the *Version* of the *Septuagint* before him, when he wrote the first Book of his *Antiquities*; and I have in the same Place proved, that he followed the *Septuagint* as to the Age at which *Adam* begat *Seth*; and also that he still agrees with the *Septuagint* in the Ages of eight at least of the *Patriarchs* before the *Flood*; and consequently that it is most probable that his original Copy did likewise agree with the *Septuagint* in the Ages of the other two *Patriarchs* before the *Flood*; and also that his

Chronology

Chronology for that Period did agree exactly with that of the *Septuagint*, which reckons 2256 Years from the Creation to the Flood, and 3873 Years, or (exclusive of the 2^d *Cainan*) 3743 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*. On the other Hand, Mr. *Whiston* contends, that *Josephus* reckoned but 1556 Years from the Creation to the Flood, and 2993 Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses*: And this he grounds wholly upon the present Reading of one single Passage, or to speak more properly, upon the present reading of one single Word (τεταχί-ων) in one single Passage in his first Book against *Apion*, viz. ἐτὶ ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τεταχίων ὀλίγον ἔτι. Now, since Mr. *Whiston* admits, that *Josephus* was an exact *Chronolo-*ger, and consequently that he could not possibly be the Author of two such different Accounts himself; I desire to be informed, which of these we may most securely rely upon. Upon that which he gives us at large, and *ex professo*, in the first Book of his *Antiquities*? Or upon this, which he mentions only, ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ, in his first Book against *Apion*? Must we alter several Passages as well as Numbers in the first Book of the *Antiquities*, to make them agree with this single Passage in his first Book against *Apion*? Or shall

shall we, by making a very small Alteration in one single Word, that is, by replacing τετρακισχιλίων * as the true and original Reading; instead of τερχιλίων in the Passage quoted from the *first* Book against *Apion*, reconcile the said Passage to the whole Tenor of the *first* Book of the *Antiquities*? I can scarcely think that Mr. *Whiston*, upon second Thoughts, will say that the former Way is preferable to the latter: And therefore, after this fair Warning, I hope ~~he~~ will be so good to himself, as to take care not to fix his Foot too securely hereafter upon such a *sandy Foundation*.

3. As to the particular Numbers, which Mr. *Whiston* has thought fit to pitch upon, in Order to make up his general Sum of 2993 Years, there is no Room for any Dispute about the three last; the *Hebrew*, the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint*, and *Josephus* all unanimously agreeing in them. But I desire to know how Mr. *Whiston* came to find out that *Josephus* ever reckoned 1556 Years from the *Creation* to the *Flood*? In Answer to this he tells us, that he can shew the Footsteps of

* That τετρ was sometimes by Mistake written for τετράκις in *Josephus*, is evident from his *Antiquities*, l. 5. c. 11. § 1. pag. 221. lin. 14, 15. where we now read that the *Philistines* killed about 4000 *Hebrews*, τετράκις χιλίους agreeable to the *Hebrew* and the *Sept.* 1 Sam. c. iv. §. 2. upon which Words Dr. *Hudson* has this Remark; τετράκις legerat vetus interpres.

this Number still remaining in *Josephus*. But how does he shew this? Why thus; most of the Manuscripts have 2656 Years; and one of them has 1—56 Years. But there is certainly a Mistake in all those Manuscripts which have 2656 Years; therefore, the Manuscript which has 1—56 points out to us the true Reading of that Place. But how shall we discover the right Figure for the hundreds? Why, if we suppose it to have been a 5, the Sum would then be 1556 Years; or if we suppose it to have been a 6, then the Sum would be 1656: But we cannot suppose it to have been 1656, because that Number would extend the Time from the *Creation* to the Death of *Moses* 93 Years beyond 3000; Therefore *Josephus* certainly reckoned no more than 1556 Years from the *Creation* to the Flood; therefore we may securely affirm that he followed the *Samaritan*, and not the *Hebrew Pentateuch*. Again, as to the second Number 892; where does Mr. *Whiston* find that *Josephus* reckoned just 892 Years from the Flood to the Birth of *Abraham*? Can he shew me this Number either in *Josephus*, or in the *Samaritan Pentateuch*? No; there is no such Number to be found in all *Josephus's* Works; and all our Copies of the *Samaritan Pentateuch* unanimously reckon 942 Years from

from the *Flood* to the *Birth* of *Abraham*. What Reason then can he give for shortning the Age of *Nabor* from 79 Years to 29 Years, contrary to the joint Authority of the *Samaritan* and the *Septuagint*, and consequently for reducing the Length of this Period from 942, or from 1072 Years, to 892 Years? A very good one, to be sure; for without this Emendation, the Number of Years from the Creation to the Death of *Moses* would again unavoidably exceed 3000 Years. Who would not study *Mathematicks* all the Days of his Life; if it were for nothing else, but only to acquire so *just*, so *clear*, and so *strong* a Way of *Reasoning*!

Dr. *Wills* had very judiciously observed, that *Josephus* being well skilled in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, and having a great Esteem for both Editions of the Bible, did indifferently make use of both, and sometimes followed one and sometimes the other. And in Support of this Opinion, he give us *eleven* Instances of his following the *Hebrew* Bible, where it differs from the *Septuagint*; and as many Instances of his making use of the *Septuagint*, where it differs from the *Hebrew*; and then he subjoins *twelve* Instances more to prove that many Times he differed from them both. But what says the accurate, the clear-sighted Mr.

Whiston

Whiston to all this? Why, upon this Occasion, he comes nothing short of the *bravest* and most *intrepid* of our *modern Criticks*: Here, he even out-does his own Out-doings: He not only roundly asserts, but even undertakes to demonstrate, That *Josephus, the famous Jewish Historian, contemporary with the Apostles of our Saviour, always made use of the Hebrew Copies of the Old Testament, and not of the Septuagint Version in his Antiquities.*

It would do ones Heart good to see how *mathematically* he *demonstrates* this *Proposition*. *Josephus*, says he, was a *Jew* and a *Priest*; he was brought up from his Childhood in the *Hebrew Law*; in the *Hebrew*, and a Dialect of it, the *Chaldee Language*; and in the *Hebrew Learning*; he wrote the History of the *Jewish War* in the *Chaldee Language* for the Use of the *Eastern Jews* in *Babylon*, before he wrote it in *Greek* for the Use of the *Western Greeks* and *Romans*. Therefore, when he afterwards wrote the *Antiquities* of his own Nation in *Greek*; he could not demean himself so much as to make use of the Version of the *Septuagint* in such a Work. This is his first Argument.

His second Argument is this; he gives us some few Examples out of *Josephus*, which

Y

agree

agree with the present *Hebrew*, and not with the *Greek*; and therefore he concludes universally, that if we carefully compare *Josephus's Antiquities* with the original *Hebrew*, and with the *Septuagint* Version, we shall easily discover that *Josephus* always, directly and singly followed the *Hebrew* and not the *Greek*.

His third Argument is not inferior to any of the foregoing. When *Josephus* quotes any Portion of Scripture, says he, he never does it (*verbatim*) in the Words of the *Septuagint*; therefore he never made use of the Version of the *Septuagint*.

Lastly, he assures us that he has *Josephus's* own Word and Authority for the Truth of what he here advances. *Josephus*, says he, expressly tells us himself; that his Books contain the Antiquities and Constitutions of the *Jewish* Nation, translated from the *Hebrew Records* themselves into *Greek*; therefore he translated all those Records out of *Hebrew* into *Greek* himself, and never once made use of the *Version* of the *Septuagint*.

The Reader, who would see these beautiful Demonstrations at more Length, may consult the 10th Proposition of Mr. *Whiston's Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament*. But for my own Part, I think there is a shorter and better Way to
end

end this Controversy. For, if the few Instances which Dr. *Wills* has given us from *Josephus*, are not sufficient to prove that he often made Use of the *Version* of the *Septuagint*, and not of the present *Hebrew*; if the numerous Instances, which I have already produced, are not sufficient to confirm the same Thing, let Mr. *Whiston* tell us how many more he would have, and we will endeavour to oblige him. In the mean Time, the following are here at his Service.

1. We read in *Josephus* *, *καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἐν ἑξ ταῖς ὡραῖς ἡμέραις Μωϋσῆς καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ φησὶ γενέσθαι. τῇ δὲ ἑβδόμῃ ἀναπαύσας καὶ λαβεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἐκχειρίαν. i. e. Et mundum sex quidem illis diebus, cum omnibus quæ in eo sunt, Moses conditum esse dicit: Septima autem quievissse Deum, Et ab operibus cessavisse: which agrees with the *Septuagint*, *Gen. ii. 2.* Καὶ σωματεύσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἀτελοῦν. καὶ κατεπαύσατο τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἐποίησε †. but*

* *Antiq. l. 1. c. 1. pag. 5.* and to the same Effect we read in *Philo* likewise, *l. 1. Leg. Allegor. p. 41.* Καὶ σωματεύσας ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἀτελοῦν.

† And that this was likewise agreeable to the *Hebrew* in the *Apostle's* Days, may be gathered from *St. Paul's* Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *cb. iv. v. 4.* καὶ κατεπαύσατο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. which, we may suppose, he would not have quoted thus from the *Sept.* had not that *Version* then agreed herein with the *Hebrew*.

differs from the *Hebrew*, which, according to the interlineary Version of *Arias Montanus*, runs thus, *Et perfecit Deus in die septimo opus suum quod fecerat: Et requievit in die septimo ab omni opere suo quod fecerat.*

2. We read in *Josephus* *, *Ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ ἄνθρωπον, χᾶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβὼν; finxit Deus hominem, accepto è terrâ limo:* which agrees exactly with the *Septuagint*, *Gen. ii. 7.* *καὶ ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ ἄνθρωπον χᾶν (λαβὼν Ald.) ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς †.* but differs from the *Hebrew*, which runs thus, *Et formavit Dominus Deus hominem pulverem de terra.*

3. We read in *Josephus* ‡, that, *Adamus primus è terra factus, posteaquam Abel fuerat occisus, Et Cais propter cædem ejus solum vertisset, παυδοποιῶν ἐφροντίζε, καὶ θαυᾶς εἶχεν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἱερεῖς, ἐπὶ τετρακοντῇ ἤδη καὶ διὰ λόγον ἀνέκλειε τῷ βίῳ, πρὸς αἷς ἑταῖρα ζήσας ἐπὶ τακτοῖα τελευτᾷ; De liberis procreandis cogitabat, vehementi proli desiderio tenebatur, annos jam agens triginta Et ducentos; quibus quum accessissent alteri Septingenti, tandem vita defunctus est.* Here are no various Readings of any Moment; and *Ruffinus's* Version agrees

* *Antiq. l. i. c. 1. p. 5. lin. 18.*

† And with this Reading agrees *Philo de Mundi opificio*, p. 30. *καὶ λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.* vid. *Cl. Grab. Dissert. de variis vitiis LXX Interpret. Vers. ante Orig. ævum illatis*, p. 23.

‡ *Antiq. l. i. c. 2. § 3. pag. 9. lin. 14—21.*

exactly

exactly with the Greek : And both agree with the *Septuagint*, Gen. c. v. §. 3, 4. But not with the present *Hebrew*.

4. We read in *Josephus* *, τὴν δὲ ἐπομβρίαν ἀρχαοτάτην φησὶν τῇ ἐξόδῳ τῶ προσημύμην μηνὸς καὶ ἐνάτῃ, *Kim autem imbrium cœpisse ait, vigesima septima die prædicti mensis*. Here are no various Readings; and *Ruffinus's* Version agrees with the Greek; and both agree exactly with the *Septuagint*, Gen. c. vii. §. 11. but not with the present *Hebrew*. This is Dr. *Wills's* first Instance; and I mention it here, because I had it among my own Remarks before I had seen his Dissertation.

5. We read in *Josephus* †; Ἀδάμ μὲν ἐν τριακοσῷ ἤδη καὶ διακοσιοσῷ ἔτει γεγονότι παῖς Σῆθ γενέσθαι; *Adamo siquidem, cum esset triginta & ducentorum annorum, Sethus filius natus est*. Here are no various Readings; and *Ruffinus's* Version agrees with the Greek; and both agree with the *Septuagint*, Gen. c. v. §. 3. but not with the present *Hebrew*. Note, some MSS here read τριακοσιασῷ instead of διακοσιασῷ, propter similes Lemniscos δια & τρια, says Dr. *Bernard*; but none read ἐκατοσῷ.

6. We read in *Josephus* ‡, that *Hebron* was seven Years older than *Tanis* in *Egypt*; wa-

* *Antiq. l. 1. c. 3. §. 3. pag. 11. lin. 17—19.*

† *Id. l. 1. c. 3. §. 4. pag. 11, lin. 24, 25.*

‡ *Id. l. 1. c. 8. §. 3. pag. 23. lin. 40, 41.*

166 *Of the CHRONOLOGY*

λαυότερα δ' ἐστὶν ἔτεσιν ἐπὶ τὰ πρὸ ΤάνιδⓈ ἢ Αἰγύπτῳ.
Illa autem septem annis est antiquior quam
Tanis Ægypti; which agrees exactly with
the *Septuagint*, *Numb. xiii. 22. Ps. lxxviii.*
12. Is. xix. 11—13. but not with the *He-*
brew, which calls this City, not *Tanis*, but
Zoan, or *Soban*. In like Manner, the City,
which in *Hebrew* (*Is. xix. 13. Jer. ii. 16.*
Ez. xxx. 13. Hos. ix. 6.) is called *Noph*, the
Sept. call *Memphis*; and so *Josephus* every
where calls it after them.

7. We read in *Josephus* *, that *Pharaoh* cal-
led *Joseph's* Name Ψονθομφάνηχ, or Ψονθομφά-
νηχⓈ; and that he gave him to Wife Ἀσάνεθ
or Ἀσανέθ the Daughter of Περσφής one of
the Priests of *Heliopolis*; which agrees with
the *Sept. Gen. xli. 45.* but differs from the
Hebrew, which says, that *Pharaoh* called *Jo-*
seph Saphnath Pabaneach, and that his Wife's
Name was *Asnath*, the Daughter of *Pothip-
pherah* Priest of *On*. And this City, which
in *Hebrew* is called *On*, the *Sept.* here, and
elsewhere, as *Exod. i. 11.* call *Heliopolis*, and
so does *Josephus* after them, *Antiq. l. 2. c. 3.*

8. We read in *Josephus* †, that when God
called *Jacob*, he answered, τί ἐστίν, *quid est*;
which agrees with the *Septuagint*, *Gen. xli.*

* *Antiq. l. 2. c. 6. § 1. pag. 59. lin. 34—40.*

† *Id. l. 2. c. 7. § 3. pag. 69. lin. 19.*

2; but not with the *Hebrew*, which has in that Verse, *Ecce ego, here am I.*

9. We read in *Josephus* *, That *Joseph* went up to meet *Israel* his Father καθ' ἡρώων πόλιν, *ad heroum urbem*; which agrees with the *Sept. Gen.* xli. 29. but not with the *Hebrew*, which runs thus; & *ascendit in occursum Israel patris sui Gbosen.*

10. In *Josephus* † *Moses's* Father-in-law is called Πατριάρχης, and his Wife Σαπφώρα or Σεπφώρα; which agrees with the *Septuagint, Exod.* ii. 18. and iv. 25. but differs from the *Hebrew*, in which the former is called *Rebuel*, and the latter *Sipporah.*

11. According to *Josephus* ‖, the Children of *Israel* came out of *Egypt* 430 Years after *Abraham* came into *Cainan*; which agrees exactly with the *LXX, Exod.* xii. 40: but differs from the *Hebrew*, which says that the Children of *Israel* dwelt 430 Years in *Egypt*; *Habitatio filiorum Israel, qua habitaverunt in Ægypto, triginta anni, & quadringenti anni.* This is *Dr. Wills's* 2^d Instance.

12. That Part of the High Priest's Robes or Holy Garments, which the *Jews* called (ἱσμήνης) *Essen* ‡, and which we translate *Pecto-*

* *Antiq. l. 2. c. 7. § 5. pag. 71. lin. 1---3.*

† *Id. l. 2. c. 11. § 2. pag. 80. lin. 26, et lib. 2. c. 13. § 1. pag. 83. lin. 2.*

‖ *Id. l. 2. c. 15. § 2. pag. 88. lin. 8---11.*

‡ *Exod. xxviii. 15. and xxxix. 8.*

rale, or Breast-plate; the *Septuagint* translate λόγιον, or λογεῖον; and accordingly *Josephus** explains it by the same Greek Word; and elsewhere † gives us the Reason why it was so translated; *Sed quod multo mirabilius est jam dicturus sum. Nam per duodecim lapides quos in pectore pontifex Essene adfutos gestat, Deus victoriam pugnaturis prænunciabat, tantus enim ex iis effulgebat splendor, cum nondum exercitus moveretur, ut toti populo manifestum fuerit, eorum auxilio adesse Deum. Unde & Græci, qui nostras solennitates reverentur, quod ne quidem hisce contradicere potuerint, Essenem appellant λόγιον or λογεῖον, oraculum.* And it is further observable, that as to the Names of the twelve precious Stones in the Breast-Plate, *Josephus* agrees better with the *Septuagint* than with our present Hebrew Copies, *Comp. Antiq. l. 2. c. 7. § 5. p. 114. lin. 12—18. with Exod. xxviii. 17—20.*

13. To make the holy anointing Oil, *Josephus* ‡ tells us, That *Moses* commanded the Jews to take σμύρνης ἐπιλέκεις σίκλας πεντακοσίας ἔ ἱσθως ἴσθες, κινναμώμας ἔ καλάμους ἡμίσησαν τῶν πρότερον ἐλκλῶ; with which the *Septuagint* agrees, *Exod. xxx. 23. ἔ σὺ λάβει ἡδύσμαλα, ἀν-*

* *Antiq. l. 2. c. 7. § 5. pag. 113. lin. 38, 39.*

† *Id. 2. c. 8. § 9. pag. 120. line. 8—16.*

‡ *Id. l. 3. c. 8. § 3. pag. 117. lin. 30—33.*

ΘⓈ Σμύρης ἁκλειῆς πεπλοσίδες σίκλας, καὶ κινναμώμῃς εὐώδης τὸ ἥμισυ τέτρα διακοσίους πενήκοντα, καὶ καλάρῃς εὐώδης διακοσίους πενήκοντα, καὶ Ἰρεως πεπλοσίδες σίκλας. But the *Hebrew* runs thus; *Sumes tibi aromata capitis, myrrbæ libertatis quingentos, & chinemon Aromatis, dimidium ipsius quinquaginta et ducentos, et Cplami Aromatis quinquaginta & ducentos; & Cassiæ quingentos in seclo (Besbekel) sanctitatis.* And it is further observable, that though the LXX translate the Word *Shakel* in the 13th Verse of this Chapter by δίδραχμον; yet here they, as well as *Josephus*, translate the same Word by σίκλⓈ.

14. The Men who were called and made meet for the Work of the Tabernacle, *Josephus* * calls Βεσαλέηλος καὶ Ελίαος: The LXX. *Exod.* xxxi. 2—6. and xxxv. 30—34. Βεσαλέηλ and Ἐλιαῶς; But the *Hebrew* calls them *Beseleel* and *Ooliab*.

15. *Josephus* † informs us, that Ἀρχομένη δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει, μηνὶ Ξανθικῷ κατὰ Μακεδόνας, Νισάν δὲ κατ' Ἑβραίους, Νεμυρία τῷ Σκηνῷ ἀφιερεῖται; i. e. *Anni vero secundi sub initium, mense Xanthico Macedonum, Hebræorum vero Nisan, ipso novilunio tabernaculum Deo consecraverunt:* which agrees with the *Sept. Exod.* xl.

* *Antiq.* l. 3. c. 8, § 4. pag. 118. l. 9.

† *Ibid.* pag. 118. lin. 16—18.

170 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

15. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ πρώτῳ, τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει, ἐκπορεύουσάντων αὐτῶν ἐξ Ἀιγύπτου, Νεμνηία, ἑσάβη ἡ σκηνή. But in the *Hebrew* the Words run thus; *et fuit in mense primo, in anno secundo, in uno mensis, erectum est tabernaculum*, Exod. xl. 17. And, perhaps it may be of some Use to observe, that, according to the *Syriac* Version, the *first Day* of the *first Month* this *Year* fell on the *first Day* of the *Week* *.

16. At the Dedication of the Altar, *Numb.* vii. 10, &c. each of the *twelve* Princes of *Israel* offered a *Silver Charger*, one *Silver Bowl*, and one *Spoon* of ten *Shekels* of *Gold*. According to the *Septuagint*, the *Silver Charger* is called *τροχάιον*; the *Silver Bowl* *φιάλη*; and the *Golden Spoon* *δυσσκη*; and from them *Josephus* describes them by the very same

* Supposing the 15th Day of the 2^d Month after the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt* to have been a *Sabbath-Day*, and that their Civil Year consisted of 365 Days, then the first Day of the 2^d Year must have fallen on the sixth Day of the Week, or on a *Friday*: But if they computed their *Ecclesiastical Years*, by the Course of the *Moon*, as it seems very probable they did; and if the first Day of this their 2^d *Ecclesiastical* Year fell on the first Day of the Week, as the *Syriac* Version has it; then, we must conclude, that on that Day there was a new Moon; and consequently, that their *Ecclesiastical* Year at that time began on the 8th Day of their *Civil* Year. Possibly, upon a more exact Examination, this may help to fix the True Year of the *Exodus*, with more Certainty than has yet been done by any of those that have wrote upon the Subject.

Names

Names *; πρὸς τέτοις ἑκάστῳ Φιάλῳ τὸ κομίζε-
 ῃ τρυβλίον ἢ θυίσκῳ.

17. In the 28th Chapter of *Numbers* and at the 11th Verse, we read; *And in the Beginnings of your Months ye shall offer a Burnt-offering unto the Lord &c*; according to the Hebrew it is, *Et in capitibus mensium vestrorum, accedere facietis ascensionem Domino &c.* but in *Josephus* † it is, τῇ ᾗ Νεμηνία τὰς τε καθημερινὰς θυσίας ἐπιτελῶσιν, &c. at *Neomeniarum solennitatibus Et quotidianas hostias immolant*; ac *præterea duos boves &c.* which agrees exactly with the LXX; ἢ ἐν ταῖς Νεμηνίαις προσάξετε ὀλοκαύτωμα Κυρίῳ, &c. The same Phrase is used again by the LXX with Regard to the *first Day* of the 7th Month; *Numb. xxix. 1, and 6.* whence we may observe, that the *first Day* of the 7th Month was always a *New Moon*; that is, in other Words, that the *first Day* of the 7th Month was always computed from a *New Moon*: And indeed, if we may depend upon the joint Testimonies of the LXX and of *Josephus*, who, I presume, will be allowed to have known the original Constitutions of their Ancestors, better than any modern Writer can

* *Antiq. l. 3. c. 8. § 10. pag. 120. lin. 31, 32.*

† *Ibid. l. 3. c. 10. § 1. pag. 122. lin. 42, 43. also § 2. pag. 123. lin. 1—3.*

pretend to; I think nothing is more evident, than that the *Jews* always regulated all their solemn Feasts by the Course of the Moon; and consequently that Mr. *Shuckford's* Notion of the *Jewish* Year, as he has explained it in the Prefaces to the first and third Volumes of his *Connection of sacred and profane History*, has no Foundation either in *Scripture* or in *Antiquity*. But to return,

18. *Josephus* * calls the Feast of the Passover Πάχα; which agrees exactly with the *Septuagint*, *Exod.* xii. 11. and *Levit.* xxiii. 5. But according to the *Hebrew*, it is wrote *Pesach*.

19. According to *Josephus* †, when the *Israelites* were to march, those who encamped on the *East* Side were to move first; οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀνατολαῖς; then those on the *South*-Side, οἱ πρὸς τὸ Νότον; next those on the *West*-Side, τὰ καὶ λίβα τῆραμμένον μέρῳ; and last of all those on the *North*-Side, τὰ καὶ βορρᾶν; which agrees with the *LXX*, *Numb.* ii. 5—6. but not with the *Hebrew*, which mentions only the *first two*, and omits the *last two*.

20. *Josephus* ‡ informs us that God appointed 48 Cities for the *Levites*; & agrum

* *Antiq.* l. 3. c. 10. § 5. pag. 124. lin. 11.

† *Ib.* l. 3. c. 12. § 6. pag. 129, 130.

‡ *Id.* l. 4. § 3. pag. 144. lin. 25. and l. 5. c. 2. § 3. pag. 193. lin. 39, 40.

pro mœnibus ad cubitos his mille (εις διχαίλιας πήχεις ἀπὸ τῶν τευχῶν) *in circuitu*; which agrees exactly with the LXX, *Numb. xxxv. 4.* but not with the *Hebrew*, which runs thus; & *suburbana urbium, quæ dabitur Levitis, à pāriete urbis, & forinsecus mille cubiti circumquaque.*

21. According to *Josephus* *, *Μωϋσῆς, ἀνέδοχον ἑαυτῷ Ἰησοῦ καθίστησιν*; which agrees with the *Sept.* where we find *Joshua* always called by the Name of *Ἰησοῦς*; but not with the *Hebrew*, where his Name is wrote *Jehoshuab*.

22. According to *Josephus* †, *Εβὺδ governed Israel to his Dying-day; τιμηθεὶς τε τῷ πλήθει ἀπαντὶ ἡγεμονία, τελευταῖα, τῷ ἀρχαῷ ἔτεσιν ὀγδοήκοντα κατασχών; totius populi principatu honoratus, vitā discedit, cum Imperium per octoginta annos tenuisset*; which agrees with the LXX. *Judges iii. 30, 31. Καὶ ἡσέχασεν ἡ γῆ ὀγδοήκοντα ἔτη, καὶ ἐκρινεν αὐτὸς Αὐδὲ ἕως τῆς ἀπώτανης.* But in the *Hebrew*, these last Words are wanting; it being only said there, *et quievit terra octoginta annis*; and no Notice taken of his governing all *Israel* to the Day of his Death.

23. *Josephus* ‡ says, that *Samuel* took *Saul* and his Servant to a Feast, and made them

* *Antiq. l. 4. c. 7. § 2. pag. 157. lin. 25, 26.*

† *Id. l. 5. c. 4. § 3. pag. 202. lin. 10—13.*

‡ *Id. l. 6. c. 4. § 1. pag. 232. lin. 14.*

fit above all the rest that were invited, in Number 70 Persons; *ἔτοι θ' ἦσαν ἐξδομήκοις τ' Ἀριθμὸν*, which agrees exactly with the LXX, *1 Sam. ix. 22*. But not with the *Hebrew*, which runs thus; *Et ipsi ferme triginta viri*.

24. When the People met to chuse a King, *Josephus* * informs us, That *Samuel* commanded them to range themselves *κατὰ φυλὰς ἔθ' σκήπτρα*, *secundum tribus & sceptras*; which agrees exactly with the LXX, 1 Sam. x. 19. but not with the *Hebrew*, which has it thus, *& state ad facies Domini ad tribus vestras & millia vestra*.

25. *Josephus* tells us †, That the first thing that got *Saul* Credit and Authority with the People, was the War with *Nabash* the *Ammonite*; and that this fell out about a Month after *Samuel* had declared him King; Μηνὶ δ' ὕστερον ἀρχὴ τῆς πάντων αὐτῷ τιμῆς ὁ πρὸς Ναάσην πόλεμος τὸν Ἀμμαϊῶν βασιλεία. *Et deinde post unum fere mensem, ei auctoritatem apud omnes peperit bellum quod gessit cum Naase Rege Ammanitarum*; which agrees with the *Roman* and *Alexandrian* Copies of the LXX, 1 Sam. xi. 1. but in the *Hebrew*, the Words *post unam fere mensem*, are wanting.

• *Antiq. l. 6. c. 4. § 4. pag. 233. lin. 30.*

† *Id.* l. 6. c. 5. § 1. pag. 234. lin. 20.

26. In the *Hebrew* we read, 1 *Sam.* xiii. 1. *Filius anni Saul in regnando ipsum*; which has very much puzzled Interpreters: But in the *Roman* and *Alexandrian* Copies of the *Septuagint*, these Words are wanting; and so they are likewise wanting in *Josephus* *.

27. *Josephus* † says, That *Saul* gathered the People together, and numbered them at *Gilgal*, and found of the *Israelites* about 400,000, and of the Tribe of *Judab* 30000; which agrees with the *Roman* and *Alexandrian* Copies of the LXX, 1 *Sam.* xv. 4. but not with the *Hebrew*; where instead of *Gilgal*, we read *Telaim*, and instead of 400,000 *Israelites*, and 30,000 Men of *Judab*, we read only 200,000 Footmen and 10,000 Men of *Judab*: These make three of the eleven Instances mentioned by *Dr. Wills*.

28. According to *Josephus* ‡, *Goliath's* Spear weighed 600 Shakels; ἔιχε δὲ καὶ λόγχην ἑξακοσίων σίκλων; which agrees with the LXX, 1 *Sam.* xvii. 7. καὶ ἡ λόγχη αὐτοῦ ἑξακοσίων σίκλων σιδήρου; et *Lancea ejus sexcentorum siclorum ferri*; but not with the *Hebrew*, which runs thus; & flamma Lanceæ ejus sexcentorum siclorum ferri.

* *Antiq.* l. 6. c. 5, & 6.

† *Id.* l. 6. c. 7. § 2. pag. 243, lin. 21—24.

‡ *Id.* l. 6. c. 9. § 1. pag. 248. lin. 34.

176 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

29. *Josephus* says *, That *Michal*, *Saul's* Daughter, took the Liver of a Goat, and laid it under the Cloaths of the Bed, where she pretended that *David* lay sick; ἡπαρ Ἀγρὸς, which agrees with the LXX, 1 *Sam.* xix. 13. but not with the *Hebrew*, which says, That she took the Skin of a Goat, *pellem caprarum*.

30. When *David* fled from *Saul* to *Nob*, we read in *Josephus* †, παρὼν δὲ καὶ Σαύλ δούλος, γένος μὲν Σύρου, Δωήκος δ' ὄνομα, τὰς τῷ βασιλείῳ ἡμίονας νέμων; tum aderat etiam Sauli servus, gente quidem Syrus, Nomine vero Doe-cus, qui regis Asinos pascebat; which agrees exactly with the LXX, 1 *Sam.* xxi. 7. but in the *Hebrew*, we read the Words thus; Et ibi vir de servis Saul, Nomen ejus Doegeb Edomæus, potentissimus pastorum qui ipsi Saul.

31. When *David* went out of *Keilah*, we read in *Josephus* ‡, that he took 400 Men with him; assumptis viris quadringentis, urbe egressus est; which agrees with the LXX, 1 *Sam.* xxiii. 13. but not with the *Hebrew*; which, instead of 400 reads 600. Et surrexit David et viri ejus ferme sexcenti viri, &c

32. The Character, which *Josephus* || gives of *Nabal* is this; ὡς δὲ Ναθαλὸς σκληρὸς καὶ πον-

* *Antiq.* l. 6. c. 11. § 4. pag. 254. lin. 39.

† *Id.* l. 6. c. 12. § 1. pag. 258. lin. 24--26.

‡ *Id.* l. 6. c. 13. § 1. pag. 262. lin. 23.

|| *Id.* l. 6. c. 13. § 6. pag. 265. lin. 23--27.

ἡγὼς τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ἐκ κυνικῆς ἀσκήσεως πε-
ποιημένος τὸν βίον. i. e. *Erat autem Nabalus du-
ro & agresti ingenio, & malis moribus, qui ex
CYNICA exercitatione vitam instituerat:*
which agrees with the Sept. 1 Sam. xxv. 3,
where he is called Ἀνθρωπος σκληρὸς & πόνηρος ἐν
ἐπιτηδεύμασι, & ὁ ἄνθρωπος ΚΥΝΙΚΟΣ: But in
the Hebrew, he is only said to be *Vir durus &
malus adinventionibus, & ipse Calibita.*

33. When David enquired of the Lord,
what the Event of the Battle with the Phi-
listines would be *, he was directed to keep
his Army in the Wood *quæ vocatur planētus*
(ἐν τοῖς ἄλσεσι τοῖς καλῶντο Κλαυθμῶσι; which
agrees with the LXX, 2 Sam. v. 23. But in
the Hebrew it is, & *venies ad eos ex adverso
mororum.*

34. According to Josephus †, the Place
where God smote Uzzab was called Ὀζᾶ δια-
κοπή, *Ozæ percussio*, which agrees with the LXX,
2 Sam. xi. 8. and 1 Chron. xiii. 11. & ἐκλήθη
ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος, Διακοπή Ὀζᾶ. But according to
the Hebrew, the Place is called *Perez-Uz-
zab*; and in our English Translation *Perez-
Uzzab.*

35. According to Josephus ‖, Solomon sent
a Navy to Soppira for Gold; εἰς τὴν πόλιν

* *Antiq. l. 7. c. 4. § 1. pag. 288. lin. 36.*

† *Id. l. 7. c. 4. § 2. pag. 289.*

‖ *Id. l. 8. c. 6. § 4. pag. 356. lin. 15.*

μὴ Σωφίραν, νῦν δὲ χρυσικὴ γλῶσσα καλεσμένη;
 which agrees with the LXX, 1 Kings ix. 28.
 but not with the Hebrew, where the Place is
 called *Ophir*. See the same, 2 Chron. viii.
 18.

36. When *Elisabab* prophesied incredible
 Plenty in *Samaria*, a Lord answered, and
 said, *Incredibilia loqueris, O Vates; & sicuti*
istud haud fieri potest, ut Deus e caelo effun-
deret Hordei & Similæ cataraētas (καταράτας
 κριθῆς & Σιμιδάλεως) *ita fieri nequeunt quæ a*
te jam dicta sunt *: which agrees with the
 LXX, 2 Kings vii. 2. ἰδὲ ποιήσει κύριος
 ΚΑΤΑΡΑΚΤΑΣ ἐν ἔργῳ, &c. but not with
 the Hebrew, *Ecce Dominus faciens fenestras in*
cælis, &c. And it is moreover observable,
 that the Person, whom the LXX calls τετάρ-
 τος in the same Verse, *Josephus*, instead of
 calling *Tertius* or *Triarius*, according to the
 Hebrew, explains the Sept. by a *Periphrasis*,
 and calls him τῆς τρίτης μοίρης ἡγεμών.

37. *Josephus* † calls *Athalia* the Daughter
 of *Abab*, Γαθολία; the LXX, 2 Kings viii. 26.
 write her Name the same Way; but in He-
 brew it is wrote thus *Hathaliabu*. And the
 like may be said of many more, if not of
 most of the Scripture Names.

* *Antiq. l. 9. c. 4. § 4. pag. 401, 402.*

† *Id. l. 9. c. 5. § 1. pag. 404. lin. 44.*

38. *Josephus* * informs us, that στρατὸς Ἀραβίων, ἡ ἐγγίσατο τῇ Αἰθιοπίας κατοικησάντων, καὶ τῶν Ἀλλοφύλων, εἰς τὴν Ἰωραμίαν βασιλείαν ἐπέβαλε; i. e. *exercitus Arabum proxime Æthiopiam incolentium, atque alienigenarum, impressionem in Joram regnum fecerunt*; which agrees with the LXX, 2 Chron. xxi. 16. but in the Hebrew, the Words are thus; *Et suscitavit Dominus super Joram, spiritum Pelistim, & Harabum, qui super manum Æthiopum*. In the same Place † we read that Joram left one Son, whose Name was Ochozias, Ὀχοζίας; which agrees with the Sept. 2 Chron. xxi. 17. but not with the Hebrew, which writes it *Jehoachaz*.

39. According to *Josephus* ‡, *Hezekiah* invited all the People to come to Jerusalem to keep the Passover, *ut celebrarent festum Azymorum*, τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτῶν; which agrees with the LXX, 2 Chron. xxx. 13, 21, 22. καὶ συνήχθησαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ λαοὶ πολλοὶ ὅτι ποιῆσαι τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἀζύμων, &c.

40. The last Instance which I shall mention, is the Prophecy of *Nabum* ||, concerning the Destruction of Nineve. Mr. *Whiston* **

* *Id. l. 9. c. 5. § 3. pag. 405. lin. 34--36.*

† *Id. ibid.*

‡ *Id. l. 9. c. 13. § 2. pag. 426. lin. 7, 8.*

|| *Id. l. 9. c. 11. § 3. pag. 422, 423.*

** Essay towards restoring the true Text, &c. p. 187, 188.

cites this Prophecy to prove that *Josephus* did not use the Version of the LXX, but that his Words are a Translation of his own from the *Hebrew*. But in this, I think, he is as unhappy as in most of his other Conjectures. For, it is neither a literal Translation from the *Hebrew*, nor copied *verbatim* from the LXX. But that he was assisted by the Version of the LXX in making the same, we may certainly conclude from the Words Νευνή—κολυμήθεα—καλοικηήμεον τῶν λεόνων—σκύμων; which are the very Words of the LXX, and which it is not likely that he could have hit upon, had he not had that Version before him. But that it is not a literal Translation from the *Hebrew*, nor yet perfectly agreeable to the LXX, I think, is likewise very plain; because in some Things he manifestly departs from both: as for Example, πῶ ὃ ἔσται τὴ καλοικηήμεον τῶν λεόνων, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ σκύμων; *ubi autem erit leonum lustrum, & leuncularum mater*; for instead of μήτηρ σκύμων; the LXX has, καὶ ἡ νομὴ ἡ ἔσται τοῖς σκύμοις, & *pascua quæ erat catulis leonum*; and in this the *Hebrew* and the *Septuagint* agree. Other Instances might be given to the same Purpose, but I am willing to spare the Reader's Patience; and shall therefore here take my Leave of Mr. *Whiston*.

S E C T. IV.

The Arguments of those who maintain that Josephus followed the Chronology of the present Hebrew Text, both before and after the Flood, consider'd.

AFTER the Remarks that I have already made on the Chronology of *Josephus*, as well as on the several foregoing *Systems* and *Hypotheses*, the more indulgent Part of my Readers may, perhaps, think, that I might have saved my self the trouble of enlarging any further upon this Part of ~~my~~ Subject. But as they on the other side, who contend, that *Josephus* always (that is, both before and after the Flood) followed our present *Hebrew* Chronology, and not that of the *Septuagint*, are far from being inconsiderable, either for their *Number*, or for their *Learning*; others peradventure might think me inexcusably negligent, if I should wholly pass by a *System* supported by such a numerous Train of Followers, and at the same Time so *diametrically* opposite to that which I am contending for. I shall therefore here take the Liberty to give these Gentlemen a *special* Hearing; and to the End that I may do it the more to the Satisfaction of the Reader, I shall single out

out one of the latest and most considerable of their Advocates to plead their Cause for them.

Monf. des Vignoles, a learned Divine and much respected in the Country where he resides, has lately obliged the World with a large and very laborious Work * on the *Chronology* of the *Holy Scriptures*, from the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt* to the *Babylonish* Captivity †. But though he “owns that the Authority of *Josephus* is of no Use to him, but only for “that Interval, to which he has confined “himself, yet, he tells us, that he could “not forbear saying something, concerning “the Manner in which *Josephus* computes “the Times that preceded the *Exodus*; on “Account of the Connexion between them “and some other Articles, which he should “be obliged to speak to in the Sequel of his “Work.”

“*Isaac Vossius*, continues Mr. *des Vignoles* †, “who has wrote a Treatise on Purpose, on “the *Chronology* of *Josephus*, pretends that “that *Jewish* Historian has followed the

* *Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte, & des Histoires Etrangères qui la concernent depuis la sortie d'Egypte jufq' à la Captivité de Babylone, par Alphonse des Vignoles, 2 Vol. 4to. à Berlin Anno 1738.*

† l. 1. § 25. pag. 109.

— † *Id. Ibid.*

“Chrono-

“ Chronology of the *Septuagint*, whereof he
 “ was a zealous Favourer. *Father Pezron*,
 “ who perpetually follows him, has main-
 “ tained the same Thing in his *Antiquité des*
 “ *Tems retablie*, and has still more strongly
 “ supported it in his Defence against *Father*
 “ *Martianay*. The last had contented him-
 “ self with saying, *That Josephus had often a-*
 “ *bandoned the Chronology of the Septuagint, in*
 “ *Order to adhere to that of the Hebrew Text:*
 “ Because he was then of Opinion, that *the*
 “ *Chronology of Josephus, with Regard to the*
 “ *Years of the Patriarchs before the Flood,*
 “ *agreed with that of the Septuagint.* Upon
 “ which *F. Pezron* maintained, that *Jose-*
 “ *phus NEVER abandoned the Chronology of*
 “ *the Septuagint, (which, as he pretends,*
 “ *was that of the ancient Hebrews) in order*
 “ *to adhere to our present Hebrew Text.*
 “ More than this, he assures us, *That there*
 “ *are no Places in that great Author, but*
 “ *what agree with the Septuagint: If there*
 “ *are some few, they are either corrupted, or*
 “ *not rightly understood.* *F. Martianay*, far
 “ from yielding the Point, declares, *That he*
 “ *did indeed agree with F. Pezron, that Jo-*
 “ *sephus had followed the Chronology of the*
 “ *Septuagint before the Flood.* But in the
 “ Continuation of his Defence, he maintains,
 “ without

“ without any Reserve, That *that Jewish*
 “ *Historian* did NEVER follow any other Cal-
 “ culation but that of the (present) Hebrew
 “ Text. F. Le Quien took part with him a-
 “ gainst F. Pezron.”

“ I have, continues this learned Writer,
 “ read the Works of those three learned Men;
 “ and I have examined their Reasons with all
 “ the Attention that I am Master of; I may
 “ even say, with a sort of Prejudice in favour
 “ of the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*. But
 “ when I have said this, I must rank myself
 “ among the Number of F. Pezron's Adver-
 “ saries. For, I believe, that in the Interval
 “ which preceded the *Exodus*, the only one
 “ which I consider at present, *Josephus* al-
 “ ways pretended to adhere to the Hebrew
 “ Text, such, almost, as we have it at this
 “ Day: And that he never had any Design
 “ to follow the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*.
 “ So far we are diametrically opposite to F.
 “ Pezron. There remains only a general An-
 “ swer, which either Side may make use of,
 “ which is this; *If there should be some Places*
 “ in *Josephus*, which contradicts either of our
 “ Opinions, we may say, that they are cor-
 “ rupted, or not rightly understood. We shall
 “ see which of us will have Recourse to this
 “ Answer with the most Success, upon the
 two

“ two following Questions; and particularly the
“ second.

So far the learned *Des Vignoles* deals fairly and candidly with his Readers. But before we proceed, I beg leave to distinguish between *Vossius* and *Pezron's* System on one side, and the real *Chronology* of *Josephus* on the other, As to the former, the Reader will doubtless have observed before now, that I am so far from defending it, that, I hope I may say, I have gone further than even Monsieur *Des Vignoles* himself in proving that it cannot be defended. The main and indeed the only essential Point which remains to be examined into here, is, whether abstracting from all and every modern System or Hypothesis whatsoever, Mons. *Des Vignoles* can demonstratively prove, that *Josephus* always followed the *Chronology* of our present Hebrew Text? or, setting strict Demonstration out of the Question, whether he can produce more numerous and more plausible Arguments to prove, that he copied after the present Hebrew, than I have already offered to prove, that he followed the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*? Upon this single Point, the whole Controversy turns: upon this single Point, I am ready to join Issue with him.

" The first of the two Questions above-
 " mentioned, says he, relates to the Duration
 " of the first Period of the World before the
 " Flood. It is collected from the Sum of
 " the Ages, at which each of the nine *Ante-*
 " *diluvian* Patriarchs begat their Sons and
 " Successors in a *genealogical* Order ; and of
 " the Age of *Noah* at the time that the De-
 " luge happened. 'But the *Hebrew* Text of
 " *Genesis*, the Version of the *Septuagint*, the
 " *Greek* Text of *Josephus*, and the Version
 " which was made from it by *Ruffinus*, as
 " *Vossius*, *Pezron*, and others generally think,
 " give us very different Sums for this Inter-
 " val. In order to compare them more easily,
 " I have drawn up the following Table.

Monf.

Monf. des Vignoles's Table.					Additional Columns.			
1 ^o	2 ^o	3 ^o	4 ^o	5 ^o	6 ^o	7 ^o	8 ^o	
Sept.	Voff.	Joleph.	Ruffin.	Hebr.	Samar.	Sept. Cor.	Jof. Cor.	
1 Adam	230	230	230	130	130	230	230	
2 Seth	205	205	105	105	105	205	205	
3 Enos	190	190	90	90	90	190	190	
4 Caiman	170	170	70	70	70	170	170	
5 Mahalaetel	165	162	162	65	65	165	165	
6 Jared	162	162	162	162	62	162	162	
7 Enoch	165	(105)	105	65	65	165	165	
8 Methufelah	147	187	187	187	67	187	187	
9 Lamech	188	82	182	182	53	182	182	
10 Noah	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	
	2222	2256	1893	1656	1307	2256	2256	
		2656	2656					

Monf. *Des Vignoles's* Table confifts only of the five Columns marked 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: To which I have added three more, for Reasons which will appear prefently. In the mean time, let us fee what he makes of his Table himfelf.

1. He fays, " That there is no Difficulty upon the fifth Column, which is taken from " the *Hebrew* Text." But as to this, I muft crave leave to differ from him. For, though all our *Western* Copies of the *Hebrew* Text agree in one and the fame Sum; yet it is as well known, that all the *Eastern* Copies of the fame *Hebrew* Text, make this Period fhorter than the others do, by the Space of 100 Years, as I have obferved before. And therefore I cannot allow, that the *Hebrew* Copies in general, are more unanimous than the Copies of the *Septuagint*, as to the Duration of this Period. And befides, fo far is this learned Author from fhewing us, which of thefe *Hebrew* Copies we ought to prefer to the other, that he does not feem to me to have known that there was any Difference at all between them.

2. He obferves, " That there is a confiderable Variety in the Version of the *Septuagint*, " whole Calculation is fet down in the firft Column, And the moft ancient and greateft " Number

“ Number of Copies, as well as the *Antwerp*,
 “ *London* and *Franeker Editions*, make *Methu-*
 “ *selah* but 167 Years old, when he begat *La-*
 “ *mech*: whence it would follow, that *Me-*
 “ *thusalah* must have survived the Deluge 14
 “ Years, as the *Fathers* have observed.” But
 with Submission to this learned Writer, I can-
 not but think that from such an *Absurdity*, a
 strict Reasoner would much sooner have con-
 cluded, that the Age at which *Methusalah* is
 there said to have begotten *Lamech*, must
 have been corrupted; nay, a very indifferent
 Master of the Art of Reasoning, in my O-
 pinion, might easily have arrived at the same
 Conclusion; since *St. Austin*, according to
 our Author's own Confession, has long since
 told us, that *in codicibus paucioribus, sed*
veracioribus, (such as the famous *Alexan-*
drian Manuscript) *Methusalah* was said to
 beget *Lamech* at the Age of 187, which in-
 tirely removes the Difficulty. Nor will the
Remark or *Distinction* of *Father le Quien* *,
 weigh much with any unprejudiced Person;
 since no Man can ever prove, that the Copy
 of the *Septuagint* which *Origen* inserted in-
 to his *Hexapla*, was in every Particular exact
 and agreeable to the original Version of the

* L'Antiquité des Temps détruite, A Paris 1692. 12mo. c. 7.
 p. 224, 225.

Septuagint; nor is it at all likely, that St. *Austin*, by his *Codices Veraciores*, could mean any Copies later than the Days of *Eusebius*; or any other Copies but only those which came nearest to the genuine Computations of the *Septuagint*. But this is not all; I deny that the first Column contains the *true* Calculation of the *Septuagint*, or that the same can now be discovered any other way but by carefully comparing our *Western* Copies of the *Septuagint* with those in the *East*, as well as with one another; and by chusing such Numbers out of them, as best agree with the most ancient *Jewish* Writers we have still left; and more especially with the corresponding Numbers still remaining in *Josephus*. And by observing this Rule, I have transferred the Numbers which I formerly pitched upon *, into the 7th Column of the foregoing Table; which I take to bid fairer than any others, for the true original Numbers of the *Septuagint*.

Our Author proceeds: "According to this
 " two-fold Reading, (*viz.* of the Age of *Me-*
 " *thuselab*, when he begat *Lamech*) many of
 " the Ancients counted 2242 Years from *A-*
 " *dam* to the *Flood*; and others 2262 Years.
 " *Vossius* and *F. Pezron* have adopted neither
 " of these Numbers: They allot 2256 Years

* Vid. Table I. p. 5.

“ to this Interval, and pretend to follow *Josephus*. And as this is the Thesis we must
“ carefully examine it.

“ We have several Editions of *Josephus* in
“ Greek; one ancient *Latin* Version, common-
“ ly ascribed to *Ruffinus*; and by others to *Epi-*
“ *phanus*; and many other Translations in
“ divers Languages.

“ The first Edition of *Josephus* in Greek,
“ was published at *Basil* by *Frobenius* in 1544.
“ It was reprinted at *Geneva*, in 1611, with
“ a *Latin* Version by *Gelenius*. *F. Pezron*
“ made use of this Edition, as appears, in
“ particular, from some Parts of his Works,
“ where he quotes the Pages thereof. And
“ it is from the same Edition that I have
“ taken the Numbers in the 3^d Column of
“ my Table. They are all the same with
“ those of the former Edition, and likewise
“ with those of the Edition printed at *Co-*
“ *logne*, that is, at *Leipsick*, in 1691. When
“ this last Edition came out, *Dr. Bernard*
“ *Professor of Astronomy at Oxford*, was at
“ Work about a new Edition, which was in-
“ terrupted by his Death, in the Beginning of
“ the Year 1696. Four Years after, the four
“ first Books of the *Antiquities*, and part of the
“ fifth; with the first Book of the *Wars of the*
“ *Jews*, and almost half of the second, was pub-
lished

"lished at *Oxford*. Father *Pezron* saw the first
 "Sheets of this Edition, before his Defence
 "was wholly printed off. For he takes no-
 "tice of it in his Preface. *F. Martianay*
 "likewise has quoted some Passages from it
 "in his Reply. Finally, in the Year 1720,
 "Dr. *Hudson*, Professor of Divinity in the
 "same University, published a new Edition
 "of all *Josephus's* Works; but without any
 "Preface or Advertisement on his Part, touch-
 "ing the Manuscripts which he made use of,
 "and whereof he has given us only a bare
 "List; that learned Man dying about the
 "End of the preceding Year." So much for
Narrative; come we next to the *argumen-*
tative Part.

"The Adversaries of *F. Pezron* and *Vof-*
fius, continues he, maintain, That in the
 "first Ages of the Church, the greatest Part
 "of the Numbers in *Josephus* were corrupted,
 "in Order to accommodate them to the *Chro-*
nology of the *Septuagint*, as may be per-
 "ceived from the Table. This Corruption
 "has not been so general, but that there have
 "still remained in *Ruffinus's* Version, many
 "Traces, sufficiently plain, of the original
 "Numbers of *Josephus*.

"Of the ten particular Numbers in *Ruffi-*
nus, the first only is the same, as in the
 "Septua-

“ *Septuagint*: Two (*viz.* the 5th and the 7th)
 “ differ both from the *Septuagint* and the *He-*
 “ *brew*: Three (*viz.* the 6th, the 8th, and the
 “ 10th) are alike throughout. And four (*viz.*
 “ the 2^d, the 3^d, the 4th, and the 9th) agree
 “ perfectly with the *Hebrew*; but differ from
 “ the *Septuagint*. Behold now, seven Num-
 “ bers in *Raffinus*’s Version, which are the
 “ same as in the *Hebrew*. So that there are
 “ but three, which have suffered any Altera-
 “ tion: And even of those three, there is on-
 “ ly the first which agrees with the LXX.
 “ These Marks of Alteration might suf-
 “ fice, if we had not another still more
 “ strong, in the Sum total of the Duration
 “ of this first Age. According to the *He-*
 “ *brew* Text, it is constantly made to amount
 “ unto 1656 Years; and according to the
 “ *Septuagint* it amounts either to 2242, or to
 “ 2262 Years. None of these Sums is ex-
 “ pressed in the Text. The Commentators
 “ or Chronologers collect them by adding the
 “ particular Numbers together. But this is
 “ not the Case with *Josephus*. As if he had
 “ foreseen what would happen to his History,
 “ or as if he would prevent Faults, too com-
 “ mon among Transcribers, he chose to spe-
 “ cify in express Words, the Duration of the
 “ first, and of the next following Age. Con-

cerning the first he says, That from Adam, who was first formed, to the Deluge, there were 2656 Years, χρόνⓄ ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ ἀδάμα τῆ πρώτῃ γεγονότⓄ ἐτῶν ὑπῆρχε διχαλίων ἑξακοσίων πενήκοντα ἕξ. which *Ruffinus* translates thus; *Usque ad hoc tempus ab Adam qui primus creatus est, anni fuerunt duo millia sexcenti quinquaginta sex.* The Greek which I have here quoted is the same in the old *Basil* Edition, in those of *Geneva* and *Cologne* or *Leipswick*; and in the last *Oxford* Edition, *Dr. Hudson* assures us that so they are read in all his Copies *Greek* and *Latin, Manuscript* and *Printed.* And I find the same Thing in the *French* Versions of *Bourgoing* and *Genebrard*: As also in two *German* Translations, which we have here in *Berlin.*

Notwithstanding of such a Multitude of Testimonies, all agreeing with one another, we see plainly, that the Number 2656 is much too great. It surpasses the greatest that has ever yet been supposed by almost 400 Years. And on the other Hand, it has scarcely any Resemblance with the Numbers 2242 or 2262, which divers Writers have collected from the *Septuagint.* But it so nearly resembles that of 1656, which is constantly the Sum in the *Hebrew* Text,

“ Text, that it is difficult not to think, that
 “ the first must have been formed from the
 “ latter, by the bare Addition of two or
 “ three Letters, that is to say, that of or from
 “ *χιλίων*, which was the original Word in
 “ *Josephus*, it has been changed to *διαχιλίων*,
 “ in Order to make it come nearer to the *Se-*
 “ *tuagint*. Dr. Bernard, in Spite of all his
 “ Prejudices, which we shall speak to a little
 “ lower, acknowledges that the *Henneberg*
 “ MS has in this Place *mille* (*χιλίων*) instead
 “ of *duo millia*, as we commonly read it.
 “ F. Martianay also assures us, that in two
 “ of the *French King's MSS* marked 2256
 “ and 2257, it is said that from *Adam* to the
 “ Deluge there were but ONE THOUSAND SIX
 “ HUNDRED FIFTY SIX YEARS. Lastly,
 “ *Monf. Le Clerc*, in an Extract of a Work
 “ of F. Benjourn reports as follows. *Josephus*
 “ may be corrected in that Place, by reading
 “ *χιλίων*, *mille*, for *διαχιλίων*, *duobus millibus*,
 “ by the Help of an ancient Greek Abstract of
 “ that Author, in the *Vatican Library*; in
 “ which we read these Words touching the
 “ Deluge; *Συνέβη δὲ τὸτο πὸ πάθος καὶ τὸ χιλι-*
 “ *οςὸν πενήκιστον ἔκλειν ἐτὶ δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ*; that is,
 “ *This Accident happened one thousand * five*
 “ *hundred and fifty six Years from Adam.*

* Mr. Des Vignoles, in a Note upon this Place, tells us, that
 so we must read the Passage.

“ After all these Proofs, adds he, I think,
 “ we can no longer doubt, but that the Sum,
 “ which we commonly find in *Josephus*, has
 “ been corrupted for a long time past: and
 “ that instead of 2656, we ought to read
 “ 1656. although this were nothing but a
 “ mere Supposition, we shall see from what
 “ follows, that it is absolutely necessary. In
 “ the mean time, let us see how *Vossius* and
 “ F. *Pezron* have endeavoured to reconcile
 “ *Josephus* to the *Septuagint*.”

As for *Vossius* and *Pezron*'s System, it is
 here intirely out of the Question; and there-
 fore I think it would be improper to trouble
 the Reader with any of our learned Author's
 Objections to it. The single Point, or *Thesis*,
 as he calls it, which we are to examine here,
 is, whether *Josephus* followed the *Septua-*
gint, and reckoned 2256 Years; or whether
 he followed the *present Hebrew Text*, and
 reckoned only 1656 Years from the *Creation*
 to the *Flood*?

In order to prove that *Josephus* followed our
 present *Hebrew Text*, *Monf. Des Vignoles*
 tells us, in the first place, that the Adversa-
 ries of *Vossius* and *Pezron* maintain, that, in
 the first Ages of the Church, the greatest part
 of the Numbers in *Josephus* were corrupted,
 in order to accommodate them to the Chrono-
 logy.

logy of the Septuagint. Now, that several of the Numbers in the Greek Copies of *Josephus* have been corrupted, I readily grant, But, I desire to know what he means by saying, That they were corrupted in the first Ages of the Church, in order to accommodate them to the Chronology of the Septuagint? Were they corrupted in those early Ages by the *Jews*, or by the *Christians*? If by the *Christians*; *cui bono*? what Benefit or Advantage could they propose to themselves by corrupting of them? Was it to confirm the the Chronology of the *Septuagint*? No; that was altogether needless to them; they neither wanted nor would have countenanced any such *pious Frauds*. All the primitive Christians, with one Voice and Consent, owned the *Divine Authority* of the Version of the *Septuagint*. Whether *Josephus* agreed with, or differed from the same in any Point of Chronology, was a Matter absolutely indifferent to them. His *Authority* for or against that Version, could neither add to, nor lessen their Opinion of it; and consequently, they could be under no Temptation to alter any of his Numbers one way or another. If by the *Jews*; I would then ask, which is most likely, that they should have altered several of *Josephus's* original Numbers in order to accommodate

commodate them to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; or, that they should have altered several of his original Numbers in order to accommodate them to the *Chronology* of the *present Hebrew Text*, and by that means to weaken and undermine the *Authority* of the *Septuagint*? The-latter, most certainly; and if so, what will *Monf. Des Vignoles* get by supposing, That any of the original Numbers in *Josephus* were corrupted by the *Jews*.

Monf. des Vignoles adds, That the *Corruptions* in *Josephus* have not been so general, but that there are still remaining in *Ruffinus's* Version, many Traces, sufficiently plain, of the original Numbers of *Josephus*. But, under Favour, I must beg Leave to ask, why this learned Writer here prefers a Latin Version * of *Josephus*, to all the printed and Manuscript Greek Copies of that Author's Works. This is a very unusual Thing with the learned; and therefore he must surely have some very weighty Reasons for it. Has he seen or had the Perusal of *Ruffinus's* original Manuscript?

* Quod ad *Josephum*, Versio illius (per *Rufinum*) ut *Casauboni* verbis utar ad *Apparat. Annalium* sect. ult. multis locis est *adinferam usque inepta*. Sed addit hoc inde provenisse, partim quod corruptissimos nactus esset *Codices*, partim quod *judicio critico destitutus*, quicquid inveniret, exprimeret. — Sane *futilissimum auctorem* vocat etiam *Josephus Scaliger*, *Appendice operis de Emendatione temporum*. *J. G. Vossius de Hist. Lat.* l. 2. c. 11. p. 208. *Lugd. Bat.* 1651.

Or,

Or, is he even sure that *Ruffinus* was the Author of this Version? Can he make it appear that the *Greek* Copy from which this Version was made, was more correct than all the other *Greek* Copies of *Josephus* then in being? Or, is he sure that neither the Translator, nor any of his Transcribers since, have ever altered any of *Josephus*'s original Numbers, in order to accommodate them to the Chronology of the Vulgate? No; fond as he is of *new Systems* and *new Discoveries*, I do not find that he has so much as attempted to offer any Thing *new* upon any of these Heads.

But further; of the *ten* particular Numbers in *Ruffinus*, the *first* makes *Adam* to beget *Seth* at the Age of 230 Years: And we are as sure that this was the original Number in his Version, as we can be of any Thing of this Nature; because he tells us the same Thing elsewhere*; and he tells it with such Circumstances as leaves no Room for any Dispute. *Adam vero*, says he, *qui primus de terrâ factus est, & de quo nos exigit narratio adhuc habere sermonem, Abel quidem extincto, Cain autem propter necem illius effugato, de filiorum procreatione cogitabat, &*

* *Antiq. l. i. c. 2. § 3.*

vehementer

vehementer eum generationis amor habebat agentem ANNOS TRIGINTA & DUCENTOS; *super quos ALTEROS vivens SEPTINGENTOS defunctus est.* Now, since it thus appears to a Demonstration that *Ruffinus's* Numbers here always agreed with the *Septuagint*, and not with the present *Hebrew*; does it not likewise necessarily follow, that the *Sum* of all his *ten Ages* or *Numbers* never did, never could agree with the *Sum* of the *Ages* of the *ten Antediluvian Patriarchs*, as they stand now in our present *Hebrew Copies*?

And if, it be impossible for any Man living to collect the *Sum* of 1656 Years from the *Ages* of the *ten Antediluvian Patriarchs* as they stand now in *Ruffinus's* Version, without making him contradict himself, both in the *Age* at which he tells us here that *Adam* began *Seth*, and in the *Number* of Years, which he likewise tells us here that *Adam* lived after the Birth of *Seth*; the Reader will easily see what Judgment we ought to pass upon our Author's next Argument drawn from the Similitude between the Numbers 2656 and 1656; upon which notwithstanding, he seems, if I mistake not, to lay much the greatest Stress.

On the other hand, let us see how the Case stands with regard to these *ten Numbers* in the

the Greek Copies of *Josephus*. In the third Column, which is taken from the Greek Edition of *Basil* in 1544, the 1st, 2^d, 3^d, 4th, 6th, 8th and 10th Numbers agree exactly with the corresponding Numbers in the *Septuagint*; which therefore I have taken and placed in the 8th Column. The fifth Number in the *Basil* Edition is 162; but in four different Greek MSS. it is wrote 165, agreeable to the *Septuagint*; and therefore I take this Number likewise, and place it in the 8th Column. The 9th Number of the 3^d Column, is evidently a Mistake; for to say nothing of *Ruffinus*, who has here 182, nor yet to insist upon the Authority of one single Greek MS. which has 182 likewise, it is manifest, that *Josephus* must have originally wrote it 182, δευτερον & ογδοηκοντα & εκατοσις ετος, and not barely δευτερον & ογδοηκοντα; otherwise *Methusalah*, who, according to him, lived to be 969 Years old, must have survived the Deluge one hundred Years; and for this Reason, I think, I am warranted in placing the Number 182 in the 8th Column, instead of the Number 82. Thus we have nine Numbers out of ten agreeing exactly with the *Septuagint*. And as to the Age of *Enoch*, when he begat *Methusalah*, it is certain, that *Ruffinus* has still preserved the centenary Number, which is want-

ting in the *Hebrew*; for his Words are, *Mathufalas autem Enoch filius quinto ei et centesimo natus anno, Lamech filium habuit*; and it is as certain, that the *Greek Copies* have only the Words *κατὰ ἑτος πέμπτον καὶ ἑξακοσόν*; so that to reconcile all the Numbers in the *Greek Copies* of *Josephus* to the *Septuagint*, there remains nothing more to be done, but to restore the Words *καὶ ἑκατοσόν* once more in this Place; for then *Josephus's* Words here will run thus, *Μαθυσάλας δὲ Ἀνώχῃ παῖς, κατ' ἑτος αὐτῷ γεγονώς πέμπτον καὶ ἑξακοσόν καὶ ἑκατοσόν Λάμειχον υἱὸν ἔχει*, &c. i. e. *Mathufalas autem Enoch filius, sexagesimo quinto ei et centesimo natus anno, Lamech filium habuit, &c.* In pursuance of this Emendation, I have also placed the Number 165 in the 8th Column, instead of the Number 65 or 105 in the 4th Column. And by this means, every one of the *ten Numbers* in the *Greek Copies* of *Josephus*, will be found to agree in all Points with the *ten* corresponding Numbers in the *Septuagint*.

Now, since these *ten Numbers* in the *Greek Copies* of *Josephus* may still be reconciled to the *ten* corresponding Numbers in the *Septuagint*, by only restoring two Words, viz. *καὶ ἑκατοσόν* in two of the Ages in the same *Greek Copies*; since we meet with nothing in
any

any other Part of *Josephus's* Works, that contradicts these Emendations: and since the Sum of the Numbers in the *Greek* Copies of *Josephus*, when thus corrected, agrees exactly with the Sum total of the Ages of the *ten* antediluvian Patriarchs, in the seventh Column, agreeable to the *Greek* Copies of the LXX, I will leave it to any indifferent Reader to determine; whether it is not infinitely more probable, that the Numbers (thus corrected) in our present *Greek* Copies of *Josephus*, are the genuine and original Numbers of that Historian, than those which we now meet with in *Ruffinus's* Version? And, in a word, whether we ought not to prefer the *Greek Chronology* of *Josephus*, which thus agrees in all Points with the *Septuagint*, to the *Latin Chronology* of *Ruffinus*, which neither agrees with, nor can possibly be reconciled either to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, or to *that* of the *present Hebrew*?

Shall I, after this, take Notice of our Author's unjust Reflections upon one of the ablest and most learned Men that ever attempted to oblige the World with a correct Edition of *Josephus's* Works? I will but just mention them, because his great and well-known Character, both for *Parts* and *Probity*, will be a better Defence than any thing that I can say

in his Behalf. " Dr. Bernard, says our Author, in spite of all his *Prejudices*, which we shall speak to a little lower, acknowledges that the *Heneberg* Manuscript has in this Place *mille* χιλιοσόν, instead of *duo* *millia*, as we commonly read it." I own he says so; but what are those *Prejudices*, which he is here accused of, and whereof we are to hear a little lower? Why, one is this; " He has not been *afraid* to insert into the Text of *Josephus* the Word διακοσίαν, which was never there before, in lieu of the Word *ἑξακοσίαν*, which he found in all his Copies." But, I beg leave to ask, how comes *Monf. Des Vignoles* to know certainly, that the Word διακοσίαν was never there before? Is not this the very Point, or at least one of the main Points in Question? The Words in all our Copies are, χρόνῳ δὲ οὗτος — ἔτων ὑπῆρχε δισχιλίαν ἑξακοσίαν πενήκοντα ἕξ. It is agreed on all hands, that *Josephus* followed either the Chronology of the present *Hebrew*, or that of the *Septuagint*. It is also admitted, that there is a Mistake either in the Word δισχιλίαν, or in the Word ἑξακοσίαν; and the Question is in which of them the Mistake most probably lies? Upon the Supposition, that the Mistake lies in the Word δισχιλίαν, and that instead thereof, *Josephus* wrote

wrote the Word *χιλίων*, Dr. Bernard might see that the Sum so corrected would then indeed agree with the Sum collected from our present *Hebrew* Copies; but he could not but plainly see at the same time, that such a Sum could not possibly agree with, or be collected from the particular Ages mentioned in *Josephus*; and consequently, he must have been sensible, that *Josephus* could not, consistently with himself, insert such a Sum in that Part of his Works. On the other hand upon the Supposition, that the Mistake lies in the Word *ἑξακοσίων*; and that *Josephus* himself wrote *διακοσίων*, he saw that the Sum then would amount unto 2256 Years; and that the same would agree not only with the Sum of the particular Ages in the *Septuagint*, but likewise with a very small Amendment, with the Sum of the particular Ages in *Josephus* himself. And therefore, far from acting arbitrarily and from Prejudice, as our Author would insinuate, what could he do more consonant to right Reason, and to all the Rules of *true Criticism*, than, by thus inserting the Word *διακοσίων*, in the Room of the corrupt Word *ἑξακοσίων*, to restore the true Reading of *Josephus* in this Place? As for the *Heneberg*, *Vatican*, and other Manuscripts referred to, they are either so corrupt, or of so little Authority, and so

over-

206 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

over-ballanced by the Testimonies of *Eutychius Alexandrinus* and *Josephus Christianus*, with Regard to the *thousands*, that no Stress can be laid upon them *.

Another of Dr. *Bernard's* Prejudices, according to our Author is this; " Dr. *Bernard* " having put into the *Greek* Text 165 Years " for the Age of *Mabalaleel*, upon the Authority of four *Greek* MS Copies of *Josephus*; " he has also put the same Number of Years " into the ancient *Latin* Version without any " Authority whatsoever." Without any Authority whatsoever! How can that be? Our Author does not deny but that he had good Reason to correct the *Greek* Copies of *Josephus*, upon the Authority of these four MSS; and if he had good Reason to correct the original *Greek*; will any one say that he had not as good Reason to correct any *Latin* Version, so as to make it agree with the original, which it pretends to copy after?

* Neque adeo exemplar *Hemberg.* movere quempiam debeat, quod tot illarum ætatum epilogsimo penitus omisso, juxta editionem *Judaicam* strictim ait, *οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς αἰῶν τοῦ χιλιετοῦ* (adde tu *Hecatontadas*) *πενήκοντες ἔτη ἵνα δὲ Ἀδάμ.* Veruntamen ipsa tempora *ωαυδοποιίας* S. Patrum, cum sexcentis Noë annis usque ad *Cataclysmum*, sic volui, oram hujus paginæ exornant: Unde confert summa accurata ann. 2256, quot etiam annos præstat *Anianus Asceta*. Cum *Josephus* autem & summam convenit *Eutychius Alexandrinus*, & per ætates singulas. Convenit etiam *Josephus Christianus*, qui disertè ait in *Hypomnestico suo*, *δὲν ἔστι Ἀδάμ ἕως Νῦν ἵτη βεβῆ.* Dr. *Bernard* in *Notis* ad locum, pag. 15.

In the next Place he tells us, That " Dr. Bernard, after owning that the same four MSS allow but 65 Years to the Age of Enoch, nevertheless makes no Scruple to put 165 Years into the Text, as *Vossius* would have it; and that he likewise puts 165 Years into the *Latin* Version, in the Place of 105 Years, which we read there. His Words are these; *Obtrudo hic numerum 60, ut vera ratio postulat, contra incuriam librariorum Latinorum. Apud hos nihil largius legas, quam quinto ei & centesimo natus anno.* Now, here the *Greek* Copies of *Josephus* have dropt the *centenary* Number; and the *Latin* Copies have dropt the *sexagenary* Number: And therefore Dr. Bernard takes in the Aid of both, and restores the true Number, viz. 165 in both, agreeable to the Version of the *Septuagint*, and to the whole Tenor of *Josephus's* Chronology in this Place. And what could an accurate and judicious Critick do less? Would he have had him to defend the corrupt Reading of the *Latin* Version, which agrees neither with the *Hebrew* nor with the *Septuagint*? Or would he have had him to defend the Number 65 in the *Greek*, which happens indeed to agree with the *Hebrew*, but can never be made to correspond with, or be reconciled to *Josephus's* other unquestionable Numbers?

Numbers? Or lastly, would he have had him to have left the Place in as *ill a Plight*, and as *corrupt* as he found it?

In the fourth and last Place he complains of Dr. Bernard "for putting 182 Years into the "Greek Text for the Age of *Lamech*, in the "Place of the 82, which stood there before; "when he had only one MS, besides the *Latin* Version of *Ruffinus*, to warrant such an "Emendation." But had he not the joint Authority of the *Hebrew* and the *Septuagint* likewise to *corroborate* those *Testimonies* and to warrant his Emendation? And was that nothing? Had Dr. Bernard made such an Emendation upon the sole Authority of one MS, or upon the sole Authority of *Ruffinus's* Version, or even upon the joint Authority of both, there might have been some Reason for such a Complaint. But when he had such powerful collateral Evidence to back him; when it appears that *Josephus* himself must have wrote 182, or must have made *Mathusalab* to survive the Flood no less than 100 Years, how could Dr. B. avoid making such an Emendation?

Monf. *Des Vignoles* concludes; "It is a sad "thing to see Men of Merit augmenting the "Corruptions in ancient Authors, under the "Pretext of correcting them. Let them care "fully

“ fully collect all the various Readings in
 “ MSS. Let them, if they please, prefer
 “ those which they find in the greatest Num-
 “ ber, in the most ancient, and in the most
 “ correct MSS. and insert them into the Text;
 “ but let them not deceive their Readers, by
 “ presenting Readings to them, which are
 “ not to be found in their Copies.” Now, I
 do agree that this is a very heavy Accusation;
 and therefore I will leave it with the Reader
 to determine, whether *Mons. Des Vignoles*
 himself, who would accommodate all the
 Ages (of this first Period) in *Ruffinus’s Latin*
 Version of *Josephus* to the *Hebrew*; or, whe-
 ther *Dr. Bernard*, who has accommodated the
 Ages (of the same Period) in the *Greek Ori-*
ginal to the *Septuagint*, has been most guilty
 of such Practices?

Mons. Des Vignoles proceeds: “ The second
 “ Question relates to the Duration of the se-
 “ cond Period, from the *Flood* to the Birth
 “ of *Abraham*. This second Question is of
 “ more Consequence than the first. All Men
 “ having perished in the Deluge, except the
 “ Family of *Noah*, it matters not much,
 “ whether we know precisely the Length of
 “ that Age or not; whether it lasted 1307
 “ Years, according to the *Samaritan*; or
 “ 1656 Years, according to the *Jews*; or

210 *Of the CHRONOLOGY*

“ 2262 Years, according to the *Septuagint*; it
 “ makes no Alteration in the Order and Essen-
 “ tials of History. But *Noah* must needs be
 “ very ancient, to have been the common
 “ Parent of all Mankind. Whether the Cal-
 “ culation of the *Hebrew* Text is large enough
 “ to account for this; or whether we must
 “ have Recourse to the *Septuagint*, is a Ques-
 “ tion by itself, which I shall not examine
 “ here; and about which the ancient Fathers
 “ perhaps gave themselves no Trouble. It is
 “ however certain, that *Josephus*, as well as
 “ they, made good Use of the *Antiquity*, the
 “ *Origin*, and the *History* of the *Jews*, against
 “ the *Heathens*. But as the Fathers always
 “ argued upon the Chronology of the *Sep-*
 “ *tuagint*, it may be presumed that *Josephus*
 “ did the same. And the rather, because the
 “ Chronology of the *Septuagint* for the two
 “ first Ages of the World, agrees with the
 “ Detail which we see at this Day in *Jose-*
 “ *phus*. This Conformity appears yet clearer
 “ in the second Age, which I am now to
 “ consider. And for this Purpose, I have
 “ drawn up a second Table upon the same
 “ Model with the first; only I have added a
 “ sixth Column here, for Reasons which will
 “ appear afterwards.”

Monf.

Monf. des Vignoles's second Table.										Addition. Columns.		
	1 Sept.	2 Voff.	3 Jofep.	4 Ruffin.	5 Hebr.	6 Erafm. Gelen. &c.				7 Samar.	8 Sept. Correct.	9 Jofeph. Correct.
1 Sem	2	12	12	12	2	2				2	2	2
2 Arphaxad	135	135	135	135	35	35				135	135	135
3 Cainan	130	130	130	130	30	30				130	130	130
4 Salah	130	130	130	130	30	30				130	130	130
5 Heber	134	134	134	134	34	34				134	134	134
6 Phaleg	130	130	130	130	30	32				130	130	130
7 Rehu	132	130	130	130	32	32				132	132	132
8 Saruch	130	132	132	130	30	32				130	130	130
9 Nahor	179	129	120	120	29	28				79	79	79
10 Thare	70	130	70	70	70	70				70	70	70
10 Abraham	1172	1192	993	991	292	295				942	1072	942

212 *Of the* CHRONOLOGY

“ These six Columns are distinguished by
 “ *two* and *two*, to the End that we may be
 “ able to compare them with the less Trou-
 “ ble. I shall begin with the two in the
 “ Middle.

“ The *Greek* of *Josephus*, and the *Latin*
 “ Version of *Ruffinus* are so alike, that there
 “ is only a Difference of two Years between
 “ them; occasioned either by the Addition of
 “ two Years to the Age of the seventh Patri-
 “ arch in the *Greek* Text, or by the Omis-
 “ sion of two Years in the Version. This
 “ exact Conformity seems at first Sight to be
 “ against us: And it would be so in *Fact*, if
 “ they who first corrupted *Josephus* had been
 “ more skilful, or more attentive. They
 “ have been so faulty in this Respect, as not
 “ to observe, that immediately before giving
 “ the Genealogies and Ages of these Patri-
 “ archs, *Josephus* had said that Abraham was
 “ *the tenth from Noah; and that he was born*
 “ *292 Years after the Deluge.* Wonderful! This
 “ no ways agrees with the *Septuagint*, and it
 “ agrees exactly with the *Hebrew*. And yet
 “ nevertheless, there are no various Readings
 “ in our Copies here. *Nil largius*, says Dr.
 “ *Bernard, exemplaria omnia quot vidi Jose-*
 “ *phi, Græca uspiam aut Latina, & ab illis*
 “ *Zonaras, P, Comestor, alii.* This Sum of

" 292 Years is found in all our *Greek* Copies, Manuscript and printed; in the ancient Writers who have cited it; in all the Versions, ancient and modern, in many Languages, and even in that of Mr. *D'Andilly*, though he had corrupted the former.

" Notwithstanding of this Unanimity, continues our Author, *Vossius* and *Pezron* pretend, that this Number has been corrupted in *Josephus*; and that we ought to substitute the Number 1192 in the room of it."

And then he enters into a long Controversy with those two Authors about their System, which makes the two first Columns of the last foregoing Table.

Having before set *Vossius* and *Pezron*'s System out of the Question, the only Point which we are now to consider is, whether the Number 292 in *Josephus* is corrupted or not? And as I have treated of this Point likewise pretty largely before, I hope, the Reader will excuse me, if, in order to avoid Repetitions, I confine myself wholly to such of *Monf. Des Vignoles*'s Arguments as relate directly to the Question.

To prove that the Sum of the Ages of the Patriarchs between the Flood and the Birth of *Abraham* is corrupted in *Josephus*, Father *Pezron* observes, " That Reason will tell us, " that

“ that, when a *general Sum* does not agree
 “ with the *several particular Sums*, of which
 “ it is said to be composed, it is more pro-
 “ bable that the *general Sum* should be cor-
 “ rupted, than that the *several Particulars*,
 “ which it is said to consist of, should be
 “ corrupted; because it is more common to
 “ fall into *one Mistake*, than into many.”
 But what says *Monf. Des Vignoles* to this?
 He cannot deny but that this Argument seems
 to carry some Probability with it: But then
 he would evade the Force of it thus:

This, says he, is not always a certain Rule,
 though it may sometimes hold good. But if
 it does not hold good here, where, I pray,
 will it ever hold good? According to our
 present *Hebrew Copies*, the Sum of the par-
 ticular Ages of the Patriarchs, between the
 Flood and the Birth of *Abraham*, amounts
 unto 292 Years: but, according to the *Sep-
 tuagint*, the Sum of the several particular
 Ages of the same Patriarchs (exclusive of the
 second *Cainan*) amounts unto 942 Years;
 and with this Account all the ancient as well
 as modern Copies of the *Samaritan Penta-
 teuch* exactly agree. Then comes *Josephus*,
 who agrees in each of the particular Ages (ex-
 cept in that of *Nabor*, which is allowed on
 all sides to be corrupted, and which, if we
 may

may depend upon the joint Testimony of some ancient *Hebrew* Copies *, as well as the *Samaritan* and the *Septuagint*, ought to be read 79 and not 120) of the same Patriarchs with the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, as well as with the *Septuagint*: and yet the general Sum in him is made to amount, not to 942 Years, as they make it, but unto 292 Years, as our present *Hebrew* Copies make it. Now, supposing that *Josephus* had the Version of the *Septuagint* before him, and likewise a *Hebrew* Copy of the Scriptures, in all respects the same with our present *Hebrew* Copies, will any one say, that he could be so senseless, as to take the several particular Ages of those Patriarchs from the *Septuagint*, and the general Sum from the *Hebrew*? Or, if it could be supposed, that he had made a Mistake here himself, will any one say, that it is not so probable, that he should mistake in the general Sum, which is but one, as that he should mistake in the several particular Sums, which are many? Or, supposing the Difference between the general Sum and the several particular Ages, as they now stand in *Josephus*, to be owing to the Mistakes of Transcribers;

* In Græcis Eusebian, apud Scalig. p. 9. we find that *Africanus*, the *Sept.* the *Hebrew*, and the *Samaritan* Pentateuch all agree in making *Nabor* beget *Terah* at the Age of 79 (76) Years, and not at the Age of 29, or 120, or 129, or 179.

which,

which, I pray, is most likely, that they should commit *one* Mistake in relation to the general Sum, and write 292 instead of 942? Or, that they should, by Mistake, have altered *six* or *seven* of the *Hebrew* Numbers, so as to agree exactly with the *Septuagint*?

Monf. *Des Vignoles* seems to have been sensible, that it was not easy to evade the Force of this Argument; and therefore he endeavours to give the thing another Turn. "The Rule, says he, which is laid down as a general Rule, is not applicable to the present Case. The *Alterations* or *Corruptions*, which one side as well as the other complain of, are not owing to the Mistakes of Transcribers. The particular Ages of the Patriarchs in *Josephus*, agree too well with those in the *Septuagint*; and the general Sum agrees too well with the *Hebrew*, to be the Effect of Negligence or Inadvertency. *Nec Casum redolet, sed Industriam*, as St. *Austin* speaks." But, under favour, can there be a plainer or more notorious Mark of Negligence or Inadvertency than this; to set down a general Sum, which does not agree with the several Particulars; or to set down several particular Numbers, which does not agree with the general Sum? Does any Man living sit down, and deliberately write Contradictions?

dictions? Such Contradictions as may be seen in the twinkling of an Eye?

He proceeds: " They must needs have
 " either designedly augmented the Ages of
 " these Patriarchs, to make them agree with
 " the *Septuagint*, but without altering the
 " general Sum, which is set down just before;
 " or they must have diminished the
 " Sum, in order to accommodate it to the
 " *Hebrew Text*, and have neglected to alter
 " the following Ages of those Patriarchs.
 " For the latter, there is no Evidence: But
 " there is nothing in the first but what is
 " very probable." Now, let us see how he
 makes this out;

" It is a known Truth, says he, that in the
 " first Ages of the Church, the Christians
 " acknowledged no other Scripture, but only
 " the Greek Version of the *Septuagint*; and
 " that the *Italic*, in particular, followed it
 " almost word for word. And it was solely
 " by this Version, that they regulated their
 " Chronology; as we see in *Theophilus of*
 " *Antioch*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Julius A-*
 " *fricanus* and *Eusebius*. And therefore, when
 " they saw in *Josephus* a Calculation, much
 " shorter than that which they saw every Day
 " in their Bibles, they made no doubt, but that
 " the first Copiers of that Author, had al-

“tered the Ages of the first Patriarchs, by the
 “Omission of one hundred Years in several of
 “them. Thus, without any Ceremony, they
 “added one hundred Years, wherever they
 “thought they were wanting, by comparing
 “*Josephus* with the *Septuagint*. But since
 “the *Septuagint* themselves, did not mention
 “the Sum total, they let that stand in *Jose-*
 “*phus* without altering it. Whence I con-
 “clude, that the Ages of the Patriarchs have
 “been altered designedly and on purpose.

Now, in Answer to these Reasons, give me leave to ask; if the first *Christians* had been so solicitous about this Affair, as he here supposes they were, why did they not alter the *general Sum* as well as the *particular Numbers*? Could they be so *sharp-sighted* as to apprehend any Inconveniency from the Disagreement between the particular Number in *Josephus* and the *Septuagint*; and at the same Time so *stupid* as not to apprehend any from the Inconsistency of the *general Sum*, which they left standing, with the *particular Numbers* which they altered?

But further: How does *Monf. des Vignoles* make it appear that any of the first *Christians* altered any of the particular Numbers in *Josephus*? Why; *Erasmus* in his Edition of *Ruffinus* at Paris in 1528; the Version of *Gelenius*

Gelenius in the *Geneva* Editions of 1611 and 1634; and the two *French* Versions of *Bourgoing* and *Genebrard*, the one published at *Lyons* in 1558, and the other at *Paris* in 1616, have inserted the Ages of the Patriarchs after the Flood according to the *Hebrew*, notwithstanding that the same Ages in their Copies of *Josephus* agreed with the *Septuagint*; and therefore *vice versâ*, the first *Christians*, who came far short of those Gentlemen in Point of Criticism, might alter the same Ages from the *Hebrew*, in Order to make them agree with the *Septuagint*. But to this it may be replied; these several Editions of *Erasmus*, *Gelenius* &c. are still extant, and may be compared with the more ancient *Greek* Copies of *Josephus*, as well as with the old *Latin* Version of *Ruffinus*, which undeniably proves that these Authors must have wilfully altered the Numbers which they found in those Originals. But has *Monf. des Vignoles* produced any Thing like this, to shew that the first *Christians* altered any of the original Numbers in *Josephus*? No; nothing like it. He could no other Way maintain his Point, but upon this Supposition; and therefore he lays it down and argues from it, as if he had proved it to be a Fact beyond all Contradiction. But to make use of one of his own Phrases;

Phrases; Is it not a *sad Thing* that he, who so lately complained of *Dr. Bernard's Prejudices* in Favour of the *Septuagint*, should so soon run into far greater and more dangerous Prejudices on the other Side; and rather than not have it thought that *Josephus* originally followed the present *Hebrew Text*, maintain that the first *Christians* were not only so wicked as designedly to corrupt the original Numbers in *Josephus*, but likewise so weak as to leave such evident Marks in the Text of such unfair Practices! Is it not a *sad Thing*, thus to see a *learned* and *eminent Divine*, scattering such *base* and *groundless* Reflexions upon the first *Christians*, who are now no more to answer for themselves! And all for what? To support an *Hypothesis*! Against which there are a thousand other unanswerable Objections! If *Monf. des Vignoles* could call *Vossius* a *HERO* by Way of *Ridicule*, only because *F. Pezron* suffered himself to be mislead by him in some Things; by what *EPITHET* shall we distinguish the Man, who would thus expose the first *Christians*, who knew no *Guile*, to the Scorn and Contempt of *Infidels*, with whom our Age so plentifully abounds!

wh
reju
d f
rou
chan
ally
ain-
y fo
inal
k as
t of
ing,
vine.
ions
no
for
inst
wer-
ould
on-
o be
what
who
who
mpt
iful-
N-

The SYNOPSIS continued.

Years from the Creation, according to the LXX and Josephus.	The 86 Egyptian Kings continued.	The 15 Generations and the 15 Dynasties of the old Chronicle continued.	The 38 Kings of Thebes continued.	Years from the Creation, according to the LXX and Josephus.
3624	30 Sethos 50 925		21 Acheufocara 1 670	4386 Troy taken
3625			22 NITOCRIS 6 676	4397
3631			23 Myrtæus, A-monodotus } 22 698	4424 The Temple of Solomon
3653			24 Thyofimares 12 710	4436
3665			25 Thinillus 8 718	4461
3673			26 Semphrucrates or Hercules } 18 736	4478
3674	31 Certos 44 969		Arpocrates } 7 743	4506 Sardanapalus comes
3689 Joseph dies, aged 110.		XVIII DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to the old Chronicle, African. and Syncellus.	27 Chuter Taurus 7 743	4512
3691 The Shepherds expelled Egypt.			28 Meures Philscorus } 12 755	4537 hobao
3698			29 Chomephta 11 766	4546 Jerusa
3710	32 Afeth 20 989	16 Generations 348 1084	30 Ancunius Ochry, Tyrannus } 60 826	4552
3718		viz. 1 Afeth 20		4567
3721	33 Amosis 22 1011	2 Amosis 26		4576
3738		3 Chebros 13		
3752 Moses born.	34 Chebron 13 1024	4 Amenophthis 21		4582
3760	35 Amephes 15 1039	5 Amerfis 22		4620
3773		6 Misaphris 13		4629
3781	36 Amenses 11 1050	7 Misphragmuthosis 26	31 Pentethyris 16 842	4630
3788				4639
3797	37 Misphragmuthosis } 16 1066		32 Hamenemes II. 23 865	4660
3799	38 Misphres 23 1089	As for the Names and Reigns of the other 9 Kings of this Dynasty, Africanus and Eusebius differ so much from one another, that it would be of no Use to mention them here.		4675
3815			33 Siftosichermes 55 920	4688
3820				4719
3832 The Children of Israel depart out of Egypt in the 141st Year of the 18th Dynasty.	39 Tuthmosis 39 1128		34 Maris 43 963	4728 The first gins.
3838				4732
3875	40 Amenophthis 34 1162			4744
3877	41 Horus 48 1210			4756
3911				4763
3918				4776
			35 Siphos, qui et Mercurius } 5 968	4807
3923			Vulcani filius } 14 982	4814
3937			36 Phurron or Nilus 5 987	4841
3942			37 Amurantheus 63 1050	4854
3959	42 Achencheres 25 1235			4862
3984	43 Athoris 29 1264			4876
4013	44 Chencheres 26 1290			
4039	45 Acheres 8 1298	XIX DYNAST. DIOSPOLIT. according to the old Chronicle and Eusebius.		4885
4047	46 Armæus vel Danaus } 9 1307			
4056	47 Ramefes or Egyptus } 68 1375	5 Generations 194 1278		4902
4084 Danaus flies into Greece.		1 Sethos 55 55		4936
4094		2 Rapfes 66 121		4984
4124	48 Amenophis 8 1383			4990
4132	49 Thuoris 17 1400			5026
4149	50 Necheplus 19 1419			5047
4160		3 Ammenephtes 40 161		5088
4168	51 Pfamuthis 13 1432			
4181	52 4 1436			
4185	53 Certos 20 1456			
4200		4 Ammenemes 26 187		5089
4205	54 Rampfis 45 1501			
4226		3 Thuoris 7 194		5108
4233				
4250	55 Amenses et Ammenemes } 26 1527	XX DYNAST. DIOSPOLIT. according to the old Chronicle.		
4276				
4292	56 Ochyras 16 1543			5114
4319	57 Amedes 27 1570	12 Generations 228 1506		
4369	58 Thuoris 50 1620	The Names and Reigns of these Kings are no where mention'd. As to the Number of Generations, Africanus and Eusebius agree with the old Chronicle; but as to the Sum of the Years, they differ both from the old Chronicle and from one another.		5135
	59 Athothis 28 1648			5153

The SYNOPSIS continued.

from the Creation, according to the LXX and Josephus.

The 86 Egyptian Kings continued.

The 15 Generations and the 15 Dynasties of the old Chronicle continued.

Troy taken.

The Temple founded.

Σωτῆρ, or Sefac, comes up against Rehoboam, and takes Jerusalem.

The first Olympiad begins.

60 Cencenes 39 1687

61 Vennepes 42 1729

62 SOUSAKEIM 34 1763

63 Pfenus 25 1788

64 Ammenophes 9 1797

65 Nephecheres 6 1803

66 Saïtes 15 1818

67 Pfinaches 9 1827

68 Petubastes 44 1871

69 Oforthon 9 1880

70 Pfammus 10 1890

71 Concharis 21 1911

72 Oforthon 15 1926

73 Tacelophes 13 1939

74 Bocchoris 44 1983

75 Sabacon Æth. 12 1995

76 Sevechon 12 2007

77 Taraces 20 2027

78 Amaes 38 2065

79 Stephinathes 27 2092

80 Nachepfus 13 2105

81 Nechaab 8 2113

82 Pfammitichus 14 2127

83 Nechaab II. 9 2136

84 Pfammuthis 17 2153

85 Vaphres 34 2187

86 Amafis 50 2237

XXI DYNAST. TANIT. according to the old Chronicle.

7 Generations 121 1627

Africanus reckons them thus;

1 Smerdes 26

2 Pfsenes 46

3 Nephelcheres 14

4 Amenophthis 9

5 Ofochon 6

6 Pfinaches 9

7 Sufennes 14

XXII DYNAST. TANIT. according to the old Chronicle.

(1.) 9 Generations 48 1675

XXIII DYNAST. DIOSPOLIT. according to the old Chronicle and Africanus.

(2.) 4 Generations 19 1764

XXIV DYNAST. SAIT. according to the old Chronicle.

(3.) 3 Generations 44 1808

XXV DYNAST. ÆTHIOP. according to the old Chronicle and Eusebius.

3 Generations 44 1852

XXVI DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to the old Chronicle.

(4.) 9 Generations 177 2029

XXVII DYNAST. PERS. according to the old Chronicle and Africanus.

8 Generations 124 2153

1 Cambyfes 6 8

2 Darius Hykasp. 36 42

3 Xerxes 21 63

4 Artabanus 6 Mo.

5 Artaxerxes 41 104

6 Xerxes II. 2 Mo.

7 Sogdianus 1 105

8 Darius the Son of Xerxes 19 124

XXVIII DYNAST. SAIT. according to the old Chronicle, Africanus and Eusebius.

1 Generation 6 2159

viz. Amyntas

XXIX DYNAST. MENDES. according to the old Chronicle and Eusebius.

(5.) 3 Generations 21 2180

XXX DYNAST. DIOSPOLIT. according to the old Chronicle.

3 Generations 18 2198

viz. Thus according to Eusebius.

1 Neftanebes 10

2 Teos 3

3 Neftanebes 5

173 Generations 2198

(1.) As to the Number of Generations, Africanus agrees with the old Chronicle, but he mentions only 3; thus;

1 Sefonchis 21

2 Oforoth 15

3 25

4 25

5 13

6 Tacellothis 13

7 42

8 42

9

Eusebius mentions 3; thus;

1 Sefenchosis 21

2 Oforthon 15

3 Tacellothis 13

(2.) Africanus reckons 4 Generations, thus;

1 Petubates 40

2 Oforchon or Hercules 8

3 Pfammus 10

4 Zet 31

Eusebius has but 3 Gen. thus;

1 Petubastes 25

2 Oforthon or Hercules 9

3 Pfammus 10

(3.) Africanus and Eusebius allow but one Gener. thus;

Bocchoris 46

or

Bochchoris or Bonchoris 44

(4.) Eusebius reckons them;

thus;

1 Ammeris 12

2 Stephanathis 7

3 Necheptos 6

4 Nechao I. 8

5 Pfammitichus 45

6 Nechao II. 17

7 Pfammuthis or Pfammitichus 17

8 Vaphris 25

9 Amofis 42

179

(5.) According to Euseb. thus;

1 Nephertites 6

2 Achoris 13

3 Pfammuthis 1

4 Anapherites 4 Mo.

5 Muthis 1

21

A SYNOPSIS of the EGYPT.

Years from the Creation, according to the LXX and Josephus.	The 86 Egyptian Kings mentioned by Syncellus.	The 15 Generations and the 15 Dynasties of the Egyptians, according to the old Chronicle apud Syncel. p. 51, 52.	The 38 Kings of Thebes, according to Eratosthenes, apud Syncellum.	The first
2256 The Flood.	1 Meftream 35 35	Menes	1 Menes 62 62	I DYNAST. THINIT. according to Africanus.
2749 Tower of Babel.	2 Curades 63 98		2 Athothes 59 121	1 Menes 62
2784				2 Athothis 57
2789 The Dispersion.	3 Aristarchus 34 132		3 Athothes II. 32 153	3 Cencenes 31
2847	4 Spanius 36 168			4 Venephes 23
2881	5 Anonymus 32 200			5 Usaphedus 20
2917	6 Anonymus 40 240			6 Miebidus 26
2949			4 Diabies 19 172	7 Semempfis 18
2955	7 Serapis 23 263			8 Bienaches 26
2989	8 Sefonchos 49 312			II DYNAST. THINIT. from Africanus and Eusebius.
3012				1 Bochus. 38
3017	9 Amenemes 29 341		5 Pemphos 18 190	2 Caachos 39
3061			6 Tegar Amachus 79 269	3 Binothris 47
3076	10 Amosis 2 343			4 Tlas 17
3090	11 Acefephthres 13 356		7 Stæchus 6 275	5 Sethenes 41
3092	12 Achoræus 9 365		8 Goformies 30 305	6 Cheres 17
3105		9 Mares 26 331	7 Nephhercheres 25	
3108	13 Amiyfis 4 369	15 Generations from Menes, who began to reign An. Mundi 2955, to the Beginning of the 16 Dynasty, An. Mundi 3398, amounting in the whole to 443	8 Sefochris 48	
3114	14 Chamois 26 395		10 Anoyphes 20 351	9 Cheneres 30
3118			11 Syrius 18 369	Here end the first and second Dynasties.
3127	15 Amesifes 65 460		12 Chnubus Gnurus 22 391	
3144			13 Rauosis 13 404	
3145			14 Biyris 10 414	
3180 The Shepherds settle in Egypt, where they continued 511 Years.	16 14 474		15 Saophis 29 443	
3209	17 Use 50 524		16 Sensoaphis 27 470	
3223			17 Moscheris 31 501	
3224 Manetho apud Joseph. c. Apian. p. 1338.	18 Ramefes 29 553		18 Musthis 33 534	
3230				
3260	19 Ramefiamenos 15 568		19 Pammus 35 569	
3273	20 Thyfimares 31 599		20 Apappus Max. 100 669	
3286				
3302	21 Ramefseus 23 622			
3306				
3317	22 Rameffiameno 19 641			
3324	23 Rameffes 39 680			
3328				
3346	24 Rameffe Vaphris 29 709			
3348				
3359	25 Concharis 6 715			
3369	26 Silites 19 734			
3377	27 Baon 44 778			
3390				
3398	28 Apachnas 36 814			
3403	29 Apophis 61 875			
3425				
3429				
3456				
3458				
3464				
3483				
3489				
3524				
3527				
3563				
3588				
3596 Joseph at the Age of 17 is sold into Egypt.			XVI DYNAST. of the TANIT. according to the old Chronicle and Euseb. begins; consisting of 8 Generations 190 633	
3603 Joseph cast into Prison.			The particular Names and Reigns of these 8 Kings or Generations, are omitted both by Africanus and Eusebius.	
3607 Joseph interprets the chief Butler and chief Baker's Dreams.			XVII DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to the old Chron. 4 Generations 103 736	
3609 Joseph interprets Pharaoh's Dreams.			The Names and Reigns according to Eusebius are	
3618 Jacob goes down into Egypt.			1 Saïtes 19 Years 19	
		2 Baon 44 63		
		3 Aphophis 14 77		
		4 Arcles 30 107		

The first XV Dynasties of MANETHO, according to Africanus and Eusebius, apud Syncellum.

THINIT. according to Africanus.	III DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to Africanus.				XI DYNAST. DIOSPOLIT. according to Afr. and Euseb.
62 62	1 Menes 62 62				16 Kings 43 43
57 119	2 Necherophes 28 88				<i>The Names and Reigns of each are wanting.</i>
31 150	3 Toforthrus 29 117				
23 173	4 Tyris 7 124				
20 193	5 Mefochris 17 141				
26 219	6 Soiphis 16 157				
18 237	7 Tolertafis 19 176				
26 263	8 Achis 42 218				
	9 Siphuris 30 248				
THINIT. from Eusebius.	10 Kerpheres 26 274				
38 301	IV DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to Africanus.	V DYNAST. ELEPHANT. according to Africanus.			
39 340	1 Soris 29 303	1 Ufercheres 28 28			
47 387	2 Suphis 63 366	2 Sephres 13 41			
17 404	3 Suphis 66 432	3 Nephercheres 20 61			
41 445	4 Mencheres 63 495	4 Sifiris 7 68			
17 462	5 Rathæfis 25 520	5 Cheres 20 88			
25 487	6 Bicheres 22 542	6 Rathurus 44 132			
48 535	7 Sebercheres 7 549	7 Mercheres 9 141			
30 565	8 Thamphthis 9 558	8 Tacheres 44 185			
first and second		9 Obnus, or Ounos 83 268			
	VI DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to Africanus.	When this Dynasty began or ended is unknown.			
	1 Othoes 30 588				
	2 Phius 3 591				
	3 Methusaphis 7 598				
	4 Phiops 100 698				
	5 Mentefuphis 1 699				
	6 NITOCRIS 12 711				
	VII DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to Africanus.				
	70 Kings reigned 70 Days.				
	VIII DYNAST. MEMPHIT. according to Africanus.				
	27 Kings 146 857				
	<i>The Names of these 27 Kings are omitted both by Africanus and Eusebius; but probably some of the last of them might be the same with the first Kings of the 18 Dynasty.</i>				

A

TH

Δημ

αλ

Η :

Χ

Ε

A N
APPENDIX,
S H E W I N G

That the CHALDEAN and ÆGYPTIAN
Antiquities, hitherto esteemed fabu-
lous, are perfectly consistent with the
Chronology of the *Septuagint*.

Διηγοισάμεν ἡμέρας ἀρχαίας, καὶ ἔτη αἰώνια ἐμνήσθην καὶ ἐμε-
λέτησα. Ψαλ. 95.

Ἡ ΣΕΛΗ'ΝΗ ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς καιρὸν αὐτῆς, ἈΝΑ'ΔΕΙΞΙΝ
ΧΡΟ'ΝΟΤ, καὶ ΣΗΜΕΙ'ΟΝ ΑἰΩ'ΝΟΣ. Σοφ. Σοφ.
εσχ. κεφ. μγ.

APPENDIX

THE

CHRONOLOGY OF THE
JEWISH
AND
CHRISTIAN
ERAS

THE
JEWISH
ERA
THE
CHRISTIAN
ERA

A
to
is,
pre
late
and
ind
Ch
Re
par
and
me

(3)

A N

APPENDIX,

CONCERNING THE

C H A L D E A N

A N D

Æ G Y P T I A N

ANTIQUITIES, &c.

I N the fourth Section of the first Part of the foregoing Dissertation, I have endeavoured to shew that the Chronology of the *Septuagint* is, on many Accounts, preferable to that of our present *Masoretic* Hebrew Text. But having lately met with the Works of two very *learned* and most *ingenious* Writers, and being thereby induced to look a little more narrowly into the *Chaldean* and *Ægyptian Antiquities*; I hope the Reader will not be displeased, if, before we part, I take the Liberty to offer such Remarks and Observations as have thereupon occurred to me upon the same Subject.

A 2

SECT.

S E C T. I.

Of the Chaldean Antiquities.

BEROSUS, by Birth a *Babylonian*, by Profession a *Priest* of exquisite Learning, and who flourished above 300 Years before the Birth of our *Blessed Saviour*, published a Work highly celebrated by all succeeding Historians, concerning the *Chaldean Antiquities*. Now, in this Work, it seems, he asserted that the *Chaldeans* reckoned *Ten Kings*, who reigned before the *Deluge* for the space of 120 *Sares*; but as we have only the bare Names of those Kings transmitted down to us, and no clear and authentic Account of what he really meant by this *Measure* of Time, many of the Learned have hitherto thought it very difficult, if not impossible, to account for the Reigns of those *Ten Antediluvian Kings* upon the foot of any of our common *Systems of Chronology*.

Syncellus ⁽¹⁾ informs us that *Berosus* reckoned by *SARES*, *NERES* and *SOSSES*; that *one Sare* consisted of 3600 Years; *one Nere* of 600 Years; and

(1) *Synceſt. Chronogr.* p. 17. Ed. Par. 1652. Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν Βηροσός διὰ Σάρων, καὶ Νήρων, καὶ Σώσων ἀνεγέγραψε. ὃν ὁ μὲν Σάρων τρισχιλίων καὶ ἑξακοσίων ἐτῶν χρόνον σημαίνει. ὁ δὲ Νήρων, ἐτῶν ἑξακοσίων. ὁ δὲ Σώσων, ἑξήκοντα. καὶ συνήκει Σάρος ἑκατὸν ἑκοσι, διὰ βασιλείων δέκα, ἅτοι χρόνον ἐτῶν Μυριάδων τεσσαρῶντα τετάρων, καὶ δύο χιλιάδων.

and *one Soss* of 60 Years; and that he made the whole Time that these *Ten Kings* reigned to amount unto 120 *Sares*, or 432000 Years; which appeared so incredible to *Eusebius*, that he made no Scruple to reject the same as altogether *fabulous*.

Anianus and *Panadorus*, ⁽²⁾ two learned *Ecclesiastics* of the *fifth Century*, blame *Eusebius* for being so injudicious as entirely to reject this Number. They imagined that *Berosus* meant no more thereby but so many Days; which they thought might be very well reconciled to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; which, according to their Copies, computed from the *Creation* to the *Deluge* only 2242 Years. For, being informed from the *Books* or *Traditions* of *Enoch*, that from the *Creation* to the Defection of some of the Children of *Seth*, when they went out and took to themselves Wives of the Posterity of *Cain*, there had passed 55167 Weeks, or 1058 *Ægyptian Years* of 365 Days each; and observing that 432000 Days, divided by 365, amounted unto 1183 *Ægyptian Years*, 6 Months, and 25 Days; and that both these Sums together, brought the Time down to the said 2242^d Year of the World; they concluded that *Berosus's* Numbers, when thus rightly understood, agreed

(2.) Apud *Synceſ.* p. 32. 41. Et *Scalig.* in *Græc. Eusebii*, p. 406. In *Animadvers.* in *Græca Euseb.* p. 406. 407.

agreed perfectly well with those of the *Septuagint*, that the Reign of *Alorus* commenced with the 1059th Year of the World; but that neither *Alorus* nor any of his Successors were properly of the *Patriarchal* or *Cainitical* Line; and that in Truth they were no other but the Heads of that Race of *Giants* or *wicked Men*, which according to the Divine History of *Moses*, Gen. ch. 6. sprung from the unlawful Mixture of both, and who continued to fill the World with all sorts of Violence and Cruelties, until such Time as it pleased God to bring an *universal Deluge* upon the Earth; and, as the great Apostle of the *Circumcision* says, *to deliver them into Chains of Darknes, to be reserved unto Judgment.*

The excellent *Scaliger*, (3) in his Remarks upon this Solution of *Anianus* and *Panadorus*, acknowledges that this is *Argutissima Ratio*, a fine Solution: *siquidem probari posset exitus τῶν χεόνων ἀβασιλύτων*; and a little after he concludes thus, *hæc certe non sunt pabula plebeiorum ingeniorum. Ideo hæc ii soli legent, qui hæc discere à natura comparati sunt, non qui nolunt, & quidem, si velint, non possunt.* And in Conformity hereto, he elsewhere (4) asserts, that the *Babylonians* reckoned by several sorts of *Sares*; as
a *Sare*

(3) In Notis ad Græca *Eusebii*, p. 406. 407.

(4) *Can. Isag.* L. 3. p. 251.

a Sare of 30 Days; a periodical Sare, consisting of 30 Lustra or 120 Years; and the great Sare consisting of 30 periodical Sares, or 3600 Years. Σάρϑ. dierum, says he, constat ex diebus triginta; mensis enim civilis Babylonius totidem dierum est. Inde τετρακτὰς omnis Σάρϑ. Babylonii dicitur. Σάρϑ. dierum est τετρακτὰς dierum; Σάρϑ. πεντηκτὰς est τετρακτὰς lustrorum, annorum 120; Σάρϑ. Μέγιστη est τετρακτὰς Σάρϑων πεντηκτῶν, annorum 3600, qui καὶ ἐξοχλῶ Σάρϑ. Chaldis dicebatur, auctore Beroso. But with all due Respect to the Memory of a Person, who, in his Life-time, made so illustrious a Figure in the Common Wealth of Letters, I own very freely that I can neither comprehend why Scaliger, who was a declared Patron of the Chronology of the present Hebrew Text, should speak so favourably of Anianus and Panodorus's Way of accounting for Berosus's Sares; than I can on the other refuse to subscribe to Petavius's (5) Censure, (though perhaps expressed in too harsh Terms) of his Explication of them in these Words: *In illa de anno Chaldaico diatriba*, says he, *quid prius, aut quid potius admirer equidem ignoro: otium hominis, qui ad fabulas istas, nugarumque tricas concinnandas tantum horarum perdidit; an fiduciam, qui sano ulli ac sobrio Gerras ac Nænias extrudi posse pro veris, ac solidis*

(5) De Doctr. Temp. L. 3. c. 6. p. 135.

lidis veterum inventis putaverit. — Hac ego in tota doctrina nihil esse defendo, quod non Scaliger ex mera divinatione, sine ullâ verisimili conjecturâ, commentitium, absurdumque texuerit. Tum in iisdem illis esse multa, quæ seipsa destruant, secumque configant.

The learned and laborious M. Des Vignoles has lately obliged the World with a large Work in two Volumes 4^{to}, intituled *Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte*, (6) in which, among many other curious Observations, he pretends to shew from the *Mosaic History of the Flood*, that the *antediluvian Months* consisted of 30 Days each; and the *Year* of 360 Days, and neither more nor less (7); that *Anianus* and *Panadorus* were in the Right in supposing that *Berosus*, by 120 *Sares* or 432000 Years, meant no more thereby but 432000 Days; but that *Syncellus*, and even *Scaliger* himself have mistaken and misrepresented their *Hypothesis*. "It appears to me," says he (8), that *Syncellus* did not rightly understand the Opinion of those two Monks; and that *Scaliger* has confounded it with those Consequences which *Syncellus* draws from it, or with that *false Account* which he has given us of it. According to *Syncellus* and "Scaliger."

(6) Printed at Berlin, An. 1738.

(7) Vol. 2. L. 6. c. 2. pag. 614—624.

(8) Ib. c. 3. §. 1. p. 628.

Scaliger, those two Monks supposed that the
antediluvian Year consisted of 365 Days;
 whence they concluded, that *one Sare* was
 equal to 9 Years, 10 Months, and 15 Days;
one Nere to one Year, seven Months, and 25
 Days; and *one Soffe* to 2 Months; so that
 120 *Sares* amounted unto 1183 Years, 6
 Months, and 25 Days." Then, after tak-
 ing Notice of the above mentioned Remark of
Scaliger in Favour of their Method, he pro-
 ceeds thus; "After so magisterial a Decision,
 may I venture to say, That, in my Opinion,
 neither *Scaliger* nor *Syncellus* rightly under-
 stood *Anianus* and *Panadorus*? That the Re-
 proach, which those Monks cast upon *Eu-*
sebius, appears to me to be well grounded?
 And to speak freely, that the Justice of their
 Censure stares one in the Face, as soon as
 you suppose, as I do, that the antient Months
 consisted of 30 Days, and the Year of 360?
 Those Monks have explained themselves up-
 on this Head in the plainest Manner that
 possibly can be. *One Sare*, say they, con-
 sists of 3600 Days; *one Nere* of 600; and
one Soffe of 60. The Computation is so easy,
 that One can scarcely want the Help of a
 Pen to reckon by. Upon this Foot, in Ef-
 fect, *one Soffe* of 60 Days makes just two
 Months; add only a Cypher to each of these

B

"Num-

“ Numbers, and you have 10 *Sosses*, or 20
 “ *Months*, or 600 *Days* equal to *one Nere*; and
 “ those Numbers multiplied again by 6, give
 “ 120 *Months*, or 3600 *Days*, or 10 *Years*,
 “ exactly equal to *one Sare*. In a Word, if
 “ you multiply 3600 the Number of Days in
 “ *one Sare*, by 120 *Sares*, the Product will
 “ give 432000 *Days* or 1200 *Years*. ” Thus
this learned and ingenious Writer.

These Calculations, I own, look pretty, and are amusing enough upon Paper. They are, if I may be allowed to say so, writ in the true *Taste* and *Spirit* of *modern Criticism*, to which such little *accidental Coincidences* seldom fail of being extremely taking. But, give me Leave to ask this most learned and ingenious Calculator; From the *Mosaic History* of the Flood, has he demonstrably proved that the antediluvian Year consisted of only 360 Days? No; he very candidly owns that he has not. *Je ne pretens pas*, says he, (9) *que ce que je viens de dire soit une Preuve demonstrative, pour tout le Monde; quoiqu'elle le soit à mon égard. i. e. I do not pretend to have proved the Thing intirely to the Satisfaction of every Body; though I am fully satisfied with it myself.* Be it so. Far be it from me to envy any learned Man, for the Satisfaction he may take in his own *Imaginations*; provided I may be allowed in my Turn to de-

(9) *Ibid.* p. 623.

clare,

clare, that I am as fully satisfied that the *Mosaic* History of the *Flood* may be as well, and even better accounted for, upon the Supposition that the Years, by which *Moses* reckons, consisted of 365 Days.

But how does Mr. *Des Vignoles* prove to his own Satisfaction, that the antediluvian Year consisted of 360 Days? By the Hebrew Text, whose Chronology he all along espouses? No; that would not suit his present purpose. How then? Why; by the Help of the *Septuagint*, and more especially of the *Alexandrian* and *Aldine* Copies thereof; which both agree that the *Tops of the Mountains were not seen 'till the first Day of the eleventh Month*; though, according to all our Hebrew Copies, *in the tenth Month, and on the first Day of the Month, were the Tops of the Mountains seen*. Now, for my Part, I am persuaded that the Reader will not be surprized, if I own that I think the Reading of the *Septuagint* in this Place, as in many others, is preferable to that of the *Hebrew*. But how comes our Author, upon this Occasion, to be so fond of the *Septuagint*? Why, like a true modern Critick again, this suited best with his way of proving that the antediluvian Year consisted of 360 Days.

To conclude; *Anianus* and *Panadorus* had a laudable and noble View in the Account which

they pretended to give of these *Chaldean Sares*. It was to shew that, how incredible soever the *Chaldean Antiquities* might appear to some, yet that in Reality they agreed to a surprizing Exactness with the *Mosaic History*, as it stood recorded in their Copies of the *Septuagint*. For, according to their *Hypothesis*, 432000 Days divided by 365, gives 1183 Years, 6 Months and 25 Days; and 1183 Years, 6 Months and 25 Days, added to 1058 Years, brings us down to the very Year in which they placed the Deluge. But had they followed Mr. *DesVignoles's* Notion of 360 Days to a Year, they could neither have placed the Beginning of *Alorus's* Reign in the 1059th Year of the World; nor have found Room for his 9 Successors, even between that Year, and the Year in which, according to their Copies, the Deluge happened. On the other hand, what End does Mr. *DesVignoles* propose by reducing the 120 *Sares* of *Berosus*, or the Reigns of his *Ten* antediluvian Kings to 1200 Years? Where are they to begin? Where to end? Does this Notion of a *Sare* reconcile the Chronology of *Berosus*, before the Flood, to that of our present *Hebrew Bibles*? or even to that of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*? Or, does it suit the Chronology of the *Septuagint* better than that of *Anianus* and *Panadorus*? No; nothing of this Kind is pretended. What other Reason
then

then could this learned Writer have for making one *Sare* of 3600 Days to consist of 10 Years, of 360 Days each; and 120 *Sares*, of 3600 Days each, to consist of 1200 Years, or 432000 Days? May I mention it without Offence? 10 multiplied by 120, produces 1200; and 3600 multiplied by 120, produces 432000. And are not these great and wonderful *Discoveries*!

Mr. *Fourmont* the Elder, Professor of *Arabic* in the *Royal Colledge of France*; Member of the *Royal Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres*; *Interpreter* and *Under-Librarian* to his Most *Christian Majesty*, has discovered a Genius capable of making surprizing Discoveries in all Parts of *Oriental Learning*; but, I fear, it has shined with him as with many more of the *best* and *brightest* Parts. For, *Favourite Systems*, *Favourite Notions*, *Favourite Nostrums*, seem to me to have led him into many Mistakes. To give an Instance of this, with Regard to the Point now before us: This most *ingenious Writer* having, in the second Volume of his learned Work, intituled *Reflexions Critiques sur les Histoires des Anciens Peuples*, given some Account of *Anianus* and *Panodorus's* System, and likewise of that of the great *Scaliger*, concludes his Remarks upon both thus ⁽¹⁰⁾; "All therefore that

we

(10) *Reflexions Crit.* Vol. 2. p. 474. Ed. Par. 1735.

“ we can conclude from their Systems, is, that
 “ to this Day, no Chronologer has rightly
 “ entered into the true Meaning of a *Chaldean*
 “ *Sare.*” Then he proceeds, and explains his
 own Notion of it thus: “According to *Moses*,
 “ and *Berosus*, there were Ten Generations be-
 “ fore the Flood: *Anianus* and *Panadorus* sup-
 “ posed a certain Number of Years to have
 “ elapsed before the Reign of *Alorus*: This
 “ Time, neither specified nor determined, ought
 “ it to be admitted or not? It ought: *Alorus*
 “ is *Adam*; we have proved that: *Adam*,
 “ without Doubt, might be the first King over
 “ Men, when he had a sufficient Number of
 “ his Race to compose a Kingdom. Now, if
 “ the *Sares*, *Neres* and *Soffes* of the *Chaldeans*
 “ remain as yet to be explained; and if they
 “ must necessarily be admitted to comprehend
 “ no more but 10 Reigns, it follows that they
 “ cannot extend from the *Creation* to the *De-*
 “ *luge*; and the only remaining Difficulty is,
 “ to fix the Time from which we must begin
 “ to reckon them. But what is *wonderful*
 “ here, and what may likewise be observed on
 “ other Occasions; for Want of tracing the
 “ Terms to their Originals, the *Greeks* have
 “ intirely mistaken one Thing, very easy in it-
 “ self, and which I will explain in few Words.
 “ What is the Meaning then of these Words,
 “ *Neres*,

“ *Neres, Soffes and Sares?* These three Words
 “ answer exactly to three *Chaldean Terms*,
 “ נהרני, *Nheroi*, *diurnus*; נעמי, *Neomi*, or *Soot*,
 “ with *Sigma*, a *Greek Termination*, Σωροι,
 “ *borarius*; סודני, *Sodoi*, *menstruus* or *lunaris*.
 “ *Nheroi* therefore mean *Days*; Σωροι or Σωσα,
 “ *Hours*, Σαροι, *Months*, or *Moons* or *Thirties*.
 “ And as these are all three *Adjectives*, it is
 “ evident that they must relate to *three Cy-*
 “ *cles*.

1°. “ *Nheroi*, the *Cycle of Days*; before the
 “ Distinction of *Hours*, Nature itself pointed
 “ out the *Night* and the *Day*; (see *Gen. I.*)
 “ the *first Cycle* therefore must have been that
 “ of *Days*: Among the *Chaldeans*, as the *Month*
 “ consisted of 30 *Days*, so it seems that this *Cy-*
 “ *cle* consisted of 9 *Days*, with a sort of *Inter-*
 “ *calation* of 1 *Day*, 9. 1. 9. 1. 9. 1. and then
 “ they began again.

2°. “ Σωροι or Σωσοι, a *Cycle of Hours*. Among
 “ the *Jews*, and probably among the *Chalde-*
 “ *ans*, the *Hours* were reckoned from 3 to 3.
 “ See the *Criticks* upon *Matth. XXVII. 45.* At
 “ 9 a *Clock* in the *Morning* they reckoned the
 “ *third Hour* of the *Day*; and at *Noon*, the
 “ *Sixth*. The *Cycle of Hours* therefore con-
 “ sisted of 4 equal *Parts*; which were reckoned
 “ over again for the *Hours* of the *Night*.
 “ Finally, as to the *Way of reckoning by*
 Hours,

" Hours, People differed extremely from another; and do so still at this Day; but *this was the Way of the Chaldeans.*

3°. "*Saros, lunaris or menstruus*; the Cycle of Months ⁽¹¹⁾. It was necessary that the Months also should return to the same Point from which they began, or to the Beginning of a Year: By this Means, they were obliged to multiply the Months by the Days, or for each Day doubled, to put two Months of 30; 30 Days, 30 Months; twice 30 Days, twice 30 Months; but 60 Months of 30 Days make exactly five Years of 360 Days, with the 25 intercalary Days. The *Sare* therefore is and could never be any Thing else but a Revolution of 5 Years, or 1800 Days; after which the Year and the Month recommenced together. It neither did nor could consist of 900 Days, because the 900th Day falls in the Middle of the third Year: And thus one *Sare* was 5 Years; Ten *Sares* 50 Years, &c.

I do

(11) *Saros. Lunaris ou Menstruus*, le Cycle de Mois: Il devoit aussi être le retour des Mois au même point d'où on les avoit pris, ou au commencement d'une Année: Par là on étoit obligé de multiplier les Mois par les Jours, ou pour chaque Jour doublé, de mettre deux Mois de 30. 30 Jours 30 Mois; deux fois 30 Jours, deux fois 30 Mois: or 60 Mois de 30 Jours font justement cinq Ans de 360 Jours, avec les 25 Jours intercalaires. Le *Sare* est donc & n'a jamais pu être qu'une Revolution de cinq Ans, ou de 1800 Jours, après quoi l'Année & les Mois recommençoient ensemble. Il n'est point & ne peut être de 900 Jours, parce que le 900^e tombe au milieu de la troisième Année: Ainsi, un *Sare* 5 Ans, dix *Sares* 50 Ans, &c.

I do not know whether I have here fully expressed Mr. *Fourmont's* Sense quite throughout this long Quotation; and more especially towards the latter End of it, concerning his *Cycle of Months*; and therefore, to prevent all Suspicion of misrepresenting him, I have taken the Liberty to give his Explication of his *Cycle of Months* in his own Words, at the Bottom of the Page, to which, for further Satisfaction, I refer the Reader. For, though his *Conclusion* upon the *Whole*, viz. *That a Sare is and could never be any Thing else, but a Revolution of 5 Years or 1800 Days*, is plain and positive enough; yet I must own I can by no Means see how this follows as a necessary Consequence from his *Premises*. But to proceed:

From the several Fragments which we have now remaining of *Berosus*, *Abydenus* and *Apollodorus*, Mr. *Fourmont* states the Reigns of the ten antediluvian Kings thus; *Alorus* reigned 10 Sares; *Alasparus* 3; *Amelon* 13; *Amenon* 12; *Metalarus* 18; *Daorus* 10; *Ædorachus* 18; *Amphis* 10; *Otiartes* 8; and *Xisuthrus* 18; the whole amounting to 120 Sares. Now, these 10 Reigns, Mr. *Fourmont* disposes thus;

Alorus or *Adam*, according to the *Hebrew*, lived 930 Years; and according to *Berosus* he reigned 10 Sares; that is, says Mr. *Fourmont*, 50 Years; therefore, continues he, his Reign

commenced with the 881th Year of *Adam's* Life; and consequently not 'till 880 Years after the Creation. To *Alorus* succeeded *Alasparus* or *Cain* 3 *Sares* or 15 Years; so that he reigned to the 945th Year of the World. To him succeeded *Amelon* 13 *Sares*; to him *Amenon* 12 *Sares*; and so on to *Otiartes* the 9th in order, who reigned 8 *Sares*.

To find the Year when these 120 *Sares*, (which, according to Mr. *Fourmont*, make but 600 Years in all) he places the Birth of *Noah* in the 1256th Year of the World; then he adds 600 Years to 880, which brings us down to the 1480th Year of the World; and because he supposes *Noah* and *Xisuthrus* to be one and the same Person, who reigned 18 *Sares* or 90 Years after *Otiartes*; he subtracts 90 from 1480, and there remains 1390; and again from 1390 he takes 1256, and there remains 134; and hence he concludes that *Noah* or *Xisuthrus* began to reign *Anno Mundi* 1390, being then 140 Years old; and that he continued to reign to the 1480th Year of the World, and no longer. " Here, continues he, the *Sares* End. And " therefore, from this Year it is that we must " begin our Reckoning, whether *descending* or " *ascending*.

1^o. " In *descending*; from the Year 1480 to " the Year 1656, or the Year of the *Deluge*, " there

" there remains 176 Years. This is the Time
" of the general Corruption mentioned in *Genesis*;
" the Time of the Troubles between the
" *Guibborim*, and the *Elohim*, or the *Alaides*;
" and consequently of *Anarchy*.

2^o. " In *ascending*; *Xisuthrus* being mani-
" festly *Noah*, wherein does *Berosus* differ from
" *Moses*? *Noah* was born in the 1256th Year
" of the World; in the 1390th Year *Xisuthrus*
" began to reign; *Noah* was 140 Years old,
" and from 1256 to 1390 there are 134 Years;
" and the Difference is 6 Years. If we mind
" these Things, *it is, with regard to the Ages*
" *before the Flood, an authentic Confirmation of*
" *the Chronology of the Masoretic Text; and*
" *more authentic, than if Moses and Berosus*
" *had agreed exactly with one another.*"

This is a short, and I hope I may say, a
faithful Account of Mr. *Fourmont's Hypothesis*.
But, if I am not greatly deceived, I think it
will be no difficult Matter to shew that it is
liable to more and much greater Objections than
that of *Anianus* and *Panadorus* above mentioned.
As for his Derivations of the Terms *Sare*, *Nere*
and *Sosse* from the *Chaldee*, I own they are
very ingenious; and the only Fault I have to
lay to his Charge on that Account, is, that,
when he came so near to the Truth, he did not
pursue it further, and make a better Use of it.

But as to all the other Parts of his System, I must beg Leave to dissent from him, for the following Reasons:

1°. I desire to know what Proof he has that the ancient *Chaldeans* divided the Day and Night into 12 hours each? or that they ever reckoned by Years of 360 Days and no more? These are Points which neither he nor any Man else has yet been able to prove; and which therefore I cannot but look upon as *mere arbitrary Suppositions*, introduced for no other End but only to serve an *Hypothesis*.

2°. Supposing that the *Chaldeans* had reckoned by Years (of 12 Months of 30 Days each, or) of 360 Days; how does it follow from thence *that a Sare is and could never be any Thing else but a Revolution of 5 Years or 1800 Days?* With all the Attention and Penetration that I am Master of, I cannot for my Life see the least Connexion between this *Conclusion* and all or any of his Premises from which he draws it. He says, It could not consist of 900 Days; because the 900th Day would fall in the Middle of the 3^d Year: I grant it. But might not a *Sare* as well consist of any other Multiple of 360 Days? as for Instance, of twice 360 Days; or thrice 360 Days, or 4 times 360 Days, or 10 times 360 Days, &c. I say why might not a *Sare* consist of any of these Multiples

tiples of 360 Days, as well as of 5 times 360 Days?

3°. For what Reason could *Alorus* or *Adam* defer taking upon himself the *Stile* and *Office* of a *King* 'till the 880th Year of the World? Was the World less fruitful in the first Ages after the *Creation*, than it was immediately after the universal Deluge? That, I presume, will scarcely be alledged; or if it should, good Proof will be required for it. If then after the Deluge Mankind multiplied so fast, as within the Space of 100 Years more or less, to be able to undertake the Building of the *Tower* of *Babel*, as they who espouse the *Hebrew* Chronology, must admit; can it be imagined that *Adam* could be without a sufficient Number of Subjects, to give him a just Title to the Regal Office, for above eight times that Number of Years?

4°. What Probability is there that *Cain*, who separated from *Adam* after the Murder of *Abel*; and, as *Josephus* ⁽¹²⁾ and others inform us, led a very wicked and impenitent Life, should succeed *Adam* after his Death, and bear rule not only over his own, but even over the Posterity of *Seth*? Is not this flatly contradicted by all the most ancient Records that we have any Account of? Does not *Syn-*
cellus

(12) Antiq. l. 1. c. 2. §. 2. pag. 8.

cellus ⁽¹³⁾ and *Cedrenus* ⁽¹⁴⁾ inform us, that *Cain* died in the same, or in the very next Year after *Adam*? Does not the former ⁽¹⁵⁾ assure us that *Adam* governed all Mankind, not only for the last 50 Years, but during the whole time of his Life? Οὗτος ἡγεμόνευσε τῷ γένει τῶν Ἀνθρώπων ΤΑ ὍΛΑ ΤΗΣ ΖΩΗΣ ἈΥΤΟΥ ἘΤΗ. Does not the Latter ⁽¹⁶⁾ say the same? Οὗτος ἡγεμόνευσε τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δι' ὅλης αὐτῆς ζωῆς. Do not both assert, that *Seth* succeeded *Adam* in the Government of Mankind? Σὴθ μετὰ Ἀδάμ ἡγεμόνευσε τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Does not the noble Jewish ⁽¹⁷⁾ Historian confirm same Thing? Does he not plainly intimate that *Seth* succeeded *Adam*; that *Enos* succeeded *Seth*; and so on to *Methuselah*; who resigned the Government to *Lamech*; and *He* again to *Noah*? The Passage I refer to most certainly, has been most grossly corrupted; and it is difficult to say, whether the Enemy that did it, has shewn more *Ignorance* or *Malice*. For though the *Excellent* and most *Accurate* Author himself tells us towards the Close of the Paragraph that, it was not necessary to set down the Time of the Death of those Patriarchs; yet we find that his *stupid Interpolator*,

(13) Chronogr. p. 11.

(14) Hist. Comp. p. 9.

(15) Chronogr. p. 11.

(16) Hist. Comp. p. 9.

(17) Antiq. l. 1. c. 3. §. 4. pag. 11. 12.

tor, not only sets down the number of Years that each of them lived; but likewise expressly makes the *three last* of *them* to have governed from the *Cradle* to the *Grave*. Which is such a manifest Absurdity, that I am surprized that ALL our late learned Editors of *Josephus*, should have passed it by without taking any notice of it. But to return,

5°. If *Alasparus* is the same with *Cain*; If the next eight Kings were of the same Race; how comes *Xisuthrus* the *tenth* and *last* to be the same with *Noah*? By what right could *Noah*, who was descended from *Seth*, break in upon the *Cainitic Line*, who had been in Possession for 8 successive Generations before him? Mr. *Fourmont* fixes the beginning of *Xisuthrus* or *Noah's* Reign to the 1390th Year of the World. But according to the *Masoretic Text*, his Father *Lamech*, his Grand father *Methuselah*, and his Great-grand-father *Jared* were then all living; and can it be imagined, that in such a Case, the *just* and *righteous Noah* would have accepted of the Government in prejudice of *Father*, *Grand-Father*, and *Great-Grand-Father*, even supposing that the Children of *Cain* would have made choice of him?

6°. By what Authority does Mr. *Fourmont* delay the time of the General Corruption mentioned
Gen.

Gen. c. VI. to the 1480th Year of the World? Does not Moses inform us, That when Men began to multiply on the Face of the Earth, and Daughters were born unto them, that the Sons of God saw the Daughters of Men that they were fair, and that they took them Wives of all which they chose, &c. And does it not thereupon immediately follow: And GOD saw that the Wickedness of Man was great in the Earth, and that every Imagination of the Thoughts of his Heart was only Evil continually? Does not Moses evidently date the General Corruption from this time? Is not Josephus⁽¹⁸⁾ yet more particular; who limits these Transactions to the times of Enoch; who according to the Hebrew, was born Anno Mundi 622, and was translated Anno Mundi 987? Nay, have not Syncellus⁽¹⁹⁾ and Cedrenus⁽²⁰⁾ upon the Authority of some Jewish Traditions, gone still farther and recorded the very Year, in which the Sons of God took to themselves Wives from the Daughters of Men, viz. in the 40th Year of Jared, Anno Mundi 500; or at the latest in the 48th Year of Enoch, Anno Mundi 670? What Reason, I say, can Mr. Fourmont give for contradicting such express Testimonies as these, and for asserting that the General

Cor-

(18) Antiq. l. i. c. 3. §. 1. pag. 10.

(19) Pag. 11. 12.

(20) Pag. 9. 10.

Corruption of Mankind did not take place till about 176 Years before the Flood?

7°. And lastly, Mr. *Fourmont* says, *If we mind how nicely the several Parts of his Hypothesis hang together, it is, with regard to the Ages before the Flood, an authentic Confirmation of the Chronology of the Masoretic Text; Nay, more authentic than if Moses and Berosus had agreed exactly with one another.* Now this is indeed nobly said: and therefore let us see what it is we are to mind. Now one of the things, it seems, which we are to mind, is that *Noah* was born in the 1256th Year of the World. At first I thought this had been a Mistake of the Printer; but upon reading on I found it was not, and that his Proofs in Confirmation of the *Masoretic Text* depend upon it. I would therefore beg leave to ask, if *Noah* was born *Anno Mundi* 1256, could he be any more than 400 Years old *Anno Mundi* 1656 when the Flood happened? And if he was then but 400 Years old, which way will this confirm the *Masoretic Text*, which says that he was then 600 Years old? On the other hand, if Mr. *Fourmont* has here mistaken the true Year of *Noah's* Birth by 200 Years, as I believe every body will agree he has, I would then be glad to know how far the Proofs, which he has here offered in Confirmation

D

mation of the *Masoretic Text*, ought to weigh with any Man of common Understanding? In the next Edition of his learned and elaborate Work, if he has any better Proofs to induce us to prefer the *Masoretic Text* to that of the LXX, I hope he will be so good as to produce them.

Mr. *Fourmont* is much displeased with *Petavius* ⁽²⁰⁾ on account of the *severe Censure* which he has passed on *Scaliger's Discourse* upon the *Chaldean Sares*; without so much as attempting to offer any thing himself towards clearing up so intricate a Point. I would not willingly give Mr. *Fourmont* any just occasion of being offended with me: and therefore as I have taken the Freedom to Examine his *Hypothesis*; I will in the next place take the Liberty to propose such Conjectures as have occurred to me upon this Subject; in hopes that he will make as free with mine as I have done with his; and set me right where he thinks I am mistaken. And

I.

Of the SOSSE.

As for the Meaning of the Word *Sosse*, I shall not dispute with Mr. *Fourmont* whether

(21) De Doctr. Temporum, l. 3. c. 6. p. 135.

it be derived from the *Chaldean Adjective* נְיֻו, or from the *Chaldean Substantive* נְיֻו; Though I am more inclined to the Latter. But I can by no means agree, that in their primary Signification, the First answered to the *Latin Adjective, Horarius*; or the Second to the *Latin Substantive, Hora*. And I believe it would be difficult to prove that the ancient *Chaldeans* or *Egyptians* divided the day, or Νύκθημερον, into 24 Hours; though the Practice has indeed been so for many Ages past. On the contrary *Censorinus* thinks it probable, that for three hundred Years after the Foundation of *Rome*, the Word *Hora* or *Hour*, was unknown to the *Romans* themselves. *Horarum nomen*, says he, *non minus annos 300 Romæ ignoratum esse credibile est* (22). And a little before this, he tells us, That it is commonly known that the Day (meaning from the Sun-rising to Sun-setting) is divided into 12 Hours; and the Night into as many. But this, says he, I believe was observed at *Rome* after *Sundials* were found out; *Sed hoc credo Romæ post reperta solaria observatum*. He adds; but what the most ancient way of dividing the Day, was, is hard to find out; *Quorum antiquissimum quod fuerit, inventu difficile est*. But if I may be allowed to conjecture, I think

D 2

ii

(22) De Die Nat. c. 23.

it not so difficult to give a shrewd Guess at least, what the most ancient Division of the Day or *Νυχθημερον* was among those whose Business it was to keep the most exact Accounts of Time; I mean the *Ancient Astronomers*. For I find but two ways among them; one, which divides the Day into 24 Hours, and each Hour into 60 Minutes; and each Minute into 60 Seconds, &c. which I take to be the latest and last invented way: and the other which divided the Day into *Sexagesimals*, or 60 equal parts; and each of them again into 60 other Parts, &c. And this way I find *Ptolemy* and *Geminus*, and *Hipparchus* made use of; and probably all the most ancient *Astronomers* from the *Remotest Antiquity*. I do therefore think it most probable that one *Chaldean Soffe* was equal to the 60th part of a Day; and consequently that 60 *Soffes* made one Day; And this Division of the Day, I conceive, agrees perfectly well with the Account which the Prophet *Isaiab* has given us of the Miracle, which GOD wrought to satisfy *Hezekiah*, That the Lord would deliver him and *Jerusalem* out of the hands of the King of *Assyria*, by making the Sun to return *Ten Degrees*, which it had gone down (*viz.* from the Meridian of *Jerusalem*) upon the *Dial* of *Abaz*. For the Word for Degrees in the *Chaldee Paraphrast*

raphraſt upon the Place, is the ſame with that abovementioned. But no body pretends that by *Degrees* here, the *Prophet* means *Degrees* of a great *Circle* in the Heavens; and *Hours* in our ſenſe of the Word, it could not poſſibly mean; becauſe at no time of the Year, could the Sun take *ten* Hours in deſcending from the *Meridian* to the *Horizon* of *Jeruſalem*. But the Sun might very well deſcend from the *Meridian* of *Jeruſalem*, ten of the *Degrees* I am contending for, or one ſixth Part of a Day, or 4 of our Hours, any day in the Year, and return again to the ſame Point, at the Command of him whom all Nature is always ready moſt chearfully to obey. If, after this Explication, Mr. *Fourmont's* Derivation of the Word *Soffe*, Σωστος, or Σωσσι, from the *Chaldee* נשׁו, ſhould ſeem too much forced; I ſubmit it, whether the ſame word may not more naturally be derived from the *Hebrew* Word שׁשׁ, *Sex*; or שׁשׁים *Sexaginta*, which is as much as to ſay, that one *Soffe* is the *Sexageſimal* or ſixtieth Part of a Day.

II.

Of the NERE.

As for the *Nere*, נרע, I conceive it may very well be derived from the *Chaldee* Word

נרע

נוֹרָא or נֹרָא, which the learned *Buxtorf* renders by the *Latin Words*, *Lux, Lumen, Luminare*, or from נֹר *splendere, illucere, illucescere*. In the first Chapter of *Genesis*, vers. 3. *And God said let there be Light, and there was Light*; and again, vers. 5. *And God called the Light Day*; for the Word *Light*, in Hebrew אֹר, *Onkelos* puts נֹרָא. And again vers. 14. *And God said let there be Lights in the Firmament of Heaven, to divide the Day from the Night: and let them be for Signs and for Seasons, and for Days and Years*; *Onkelos* renders the Words thus: *Et dixit Deus, sint luminaria* (נֹרָא) *in firmamento cæli, ut dividant inter diem & noctem: & sint in signa & in tempora; & ut numerentur per ea dies & anni*. Now since it thus appears that the Word נֹרָא, is applied to the *Moon* as well as to the *Sun*, I do not know but that the *Chaldeans* might have had two Sorts of *Neres*: One, consisting of a certain *Cycle* or *Period* of Days, measured by the *diurnal Revolutions* of the *Sun*; and another, not at first of any known determinate Length, but commensurate to the Time which they observed the *Moon* to take up from one *Full Moon* or from one *New Moon* to another; and consequently that as the *Solar Period* consisted of a certain Number of Days or *lesser Neres*; so the great *Lunar Period* or *Sare* consisted of

a cer-

a certain Number of *Lunar Revolutions* or *Greater Neres*.

Of what Number of *Days* or *Neres* the *Solar Period* consisted, is hard to determine. But we may presume that they would endeavour to suit it as near as they could to the *Lunar Nere* (23). And therefore, as they could not but soon observe that the Moon goes through all the Variety of Appearances which she puts on in the Space of about 29 or 30 Days; and so repeats the same over and over again; I apprehend that the *Period*, which they would most probably chuse to reckon by, would be that of 10 Days: For no other Submultiple of whole Days, but 2, 3, 5, 10, & 15. come tolerably near to the true Length of a *Lunar Nere*; and of all these, the Number 10 will easily be allowed to be the most commodious for common Use. Nay, I find by *Diodorus Siculus* (24), that in Fact, the *Chaldeans* had a *Period* of 10 Days, which they reckoned by, and which they esteemed *sacred* and *immutable*. The Reasons which they gave for this are too long to transcribe here: the Reader may see them at large in *Diodorus* himself, who concludes his Account of them in these Words:

Kai

(23) Petav. de Doctr. Temp. l. 9. c. 9. pag. *Est enim antiquissima illa ratio, mensura intervalla diebus 30 desumendi: quod hic Modus ad LUNÆ CIRCUITUS propius accedere videatur.*

(24) L. 2. p. 82.

Καὶ ταύτην ἔχεν αὐτὸς φορὰν ὡρισμένην, ἢ ΠΕ-
 ΡΙΟΔΩ κεκυρωμένῳ Αἰωνίῳ. I am therefore
 strongly inclined to think that, one of the first
 and most ancient Ways of keeping an Account
 of Time among the *Chaldeans* was by a Cycle
 or Period of 10 Days.

The *Divine Penman* of the *Pentateuch*, to
 whom, most assuredly, the *true Principles* of
Philosophy, and all the *Mysteries* of *Nature* were
 revealed, assures us that *God created the Hea-*
vens and the Earth in SIX Days; that he rested
on the SEVENTH Day from all the Work which
he had made; and that he blessed the SEVENTH
Day and sanctified it; because that in it he had
rested from all his Works which he had made.
 Now, since it is absolutely necessary that all
 Mankind should have some Measure or other
 for Time; I think it must necessarily be ad-
 mitted that the first Measure which Mankind
 made Use of was a Cycle or Period of SEVEN (25)
 Days,

(25) This seems to agree with the Traditions of *Enoch* in *Syncl.*
Chronogr. p. 32—34; and in *Cedren. Hist. Comp.* p. 11. And
 to the Opinion of those who counted from the Creation to the
 1058th Year of the World 55167 Weeks, &c. — And with the
Targum upon *Job* ch. I. vers. 13. *And there was a Day when*
his Sons and his Daughters were eating and drinking Wine in their
eldest Brother's House; which they explain thus: Et factum est
DIE PRIMO HEBDOMADIS, & filii ejus & filiae ejus com-
debant & bibebant vinum in domo fratris sui primogeniti. And
 with *Gen. XXIX, 26, 27.* And *Laban* said, it must not be so done
 in our Country, to give the younger before the firstborn; fulfil her
 Week, imple *Hebdomadam* hujus. — vers. 28. And *Jacob*
 did so, and fulfilled her Week, & complevit *Hebdomadam* illius.

And

Days, in Commemoration of the great and most astonishing Work of Creation; and that this Period was constantly made use of by those of the Holy Patriarchal Line from Adam to Moses, though perhaps not kept always with that Respect

And whoever will take the Pains carefully to read the 16th Chapter of Exodus, will, if I am not very much mistaken, find not only that the Observation of the 7th Day was not then first instituted, but that on the contrary, it was one of those standing LAWS which GOD had given to their Forefathers; which therefore they were all along indispensably bound to observe. In the 4th and 5th verses, *The LORD said unto Moses, behold, I will rain Bread from Heaven for you, and the People shall go out and gather a certain Rate every Day, that I MAY PROVE THEM, whether they will walk in MY LAW or no. And it shall come to pass that on the SIXTH DAY, they shall prepare that which they shall bring in, and it shall be TWICE as much as they gathered daily.* Now, as here, Provision is made for their Subsistence on the Seventh Day, without the least Mention of the Seventh Day, and without the least Intimation at that Time, that they were to keep it holy; does it not clearly follow that the People knew beforehand, that the Keeping Holy the Seventh Day, made a Part of that LAW of GOD which they had received from their Ancestors; and consequently that they wanted no new Law or Command, in order to oblige them to keep it holy? Again, in the 23d, 24th and 25th Verses, where Mention is made of the Sabbath or Seventh Day, is there any Words that can be strained so as to shew that the Keeping of the Seventh Day was then first instituted or made known to the Israelites? On the other Hand, in the 27th and 28th Verses, do we not read, that when some of the People went out on the Seventh Day to gather Manna, and found none, the LORD said unto Moses, *How long refuse ye to keep MY COMMANDMENTS and MY LAWS?* Are not these COMMANDMENTS and LAWS the same with the LAW mentioned in the fourth Verse, and which was in Force at the very Time that GOD promised to rain Bread from Heaven for them? Does not this evidently prove that the Keeping Holy the Seventh Day was one of those LAWS which they had received from their Ancestors, and which they were obliged to observe before as well as after this miraculous Interposition of the Divine Power and Goodness in their Favour? Is not this perfectly agreeable to the Words of Moses, when he comes to insert this Law among others in the 20th Chapter of Exodus, REMEMBER the Sabbath-day to keep it holy? &c.

Respect which was due to the *Seventh Day*; 'till the latter enforced the due Observance of it, a second Time, by these remarkable Words, REMEMBER the *Sabbath-Day* to keep it Holy, &c. For in SIX Days the LORD made Heaven and Earth, the Sea and all that in them is, and rested the *Seventh Day*; wherefore the LORD blessed the *Seventh Day* and Hallowed it. And so great and unalterable was the Obligation upon all Mankind to keep Holy the *Seventh Day*, that none but a greater than the greatest of the *Prophets* could alter it; I mean our Lord *Jesus Christ*, the Only begotten Son of God, and the Saviour of the World; who by an Act of Power, Wisdom and Goodness infinitely transcending that of *Creation* itself; that is, by his own *Resurrection from the Dead*, hath transferred the Obligation of keeping holy One Day in Seven from the *Seventh* to the *First Day* of the *Week*.

But though it thus appears that a *Cycle* or *Period* of Seven Days was of *Divine Institution*, and consequently the first and most ancient of any; I think it will not appear very surprizing that any Nation or People, when they began to forget God himself, and to rush headlong, as I may say, into *Idolatry*, should likewise cease to make use of that *Cycle* or *Period* which God had enjoyed them to observe; and afterwards

wards to set up another of their own Invention in its Room. And indeed when they had resolved to reject *all Divine Authority*, and to set up their own *Reason* in its Room; when they were determined to have a Cycle or Period of their own chusing, and not of God's prescribing; what could they chuse more proper for their Purpose than a *Cycle* or Period of 10 Days? What Number more celebrated among the Ancients than the Number Ten? The *Decade* they considered as the most perfect of all Numbers; as containing within it self all sorts of Numbers; *equal* or *even* Numbers, as 2; *uneven* or *odd*, as 3; *compounded* of *both* as 5; the first *Square*, 4; the first *Cube* 8; the first *perfect* Number 6, all whose Parts are equal to the whole: It is produced by the continual Multiplication of its own *aliquot Parts* 1, 2, and 5 into one another: It is composed of the 4 *first Numbers*, 1, 2, 3, 4; as 1, 2, 3 and 4, added together make 10; so 10, 20, 30 and 40 added together make 100; and 100, 200, 300 and 400, make 1000; &c. In a Word, the Number *Ten* is called in *Greek*, Δεκάς, ὡς δεκάτην πάντων τῶν Ἀριθμῶν; that is, because it *comprehends all Numbers*: for when you have numbered as far as Ten, you stop and begin again, and repeat the same Numbers to 20, 30, 40, 50, &c. Now if

the *Chaldeans* would not make use of the original *Cycle* or *Period* of seven Days; could they substitute any other in its Room more fit for all uses then this of *Ten* Days? And from this *Chaldean Cycle*, is it not highly probable, that the *Greeks* took the first hint not only of Reckoning by *Lunar Months*, but likewise of dividing them into 3 times 10 Days; that is, from the first to the tenth Day thus; 1^o. *Νημνία*, 2^o. *δευτέρα* Ἰσαμένε. 3^o. *τρίτη* Ἰσαμένε, and so on to the 10th, *δεκάτη* Ἰσαμένε; and from the 10th to the 20th thus; *πρώτη* Μεσσηντος, or *πρώτη* ἐπὶ δεκάδι; *δευτέρα* Μεσσηντος, or *δευτέρα* ἐπὶ δεκάδι; &c. and so on to the 20th, called by them, *Εἰκάς* or *Εικοστή*; and from the 21st to the last Day of the Month, thus; *δεκάτη* φθινόωτο, or *πρώτη* ἐπὶ δεκάδι; *ἑννάτη* φθινόωτο, or *δευτέρα* ὑπὲρ δεκάδι; and so on to the 30th, which they called, *ἐν τῇ Νέᾳ*, or *τριακάς*. Now these things being considered, can it be doubted whether one of the first and most ancient Measures of Time among the *Chaldeans*, consisted of a Cycle or Period of Ten lesser Neres, Days or Diurnal Revolutions of the Sun?

III.

Of the SARE.

Come we next to the Word *Sare*, *Sarus*, Σαρ or Σαρη, which I conceive, may be more properly derived from the *Chaldee* Substantive סָרָא *Luna*, than from the Adjective סָרָא *Lunaris* or *Menstruus*. For, if I mistake not, this Period or Cycle depended altogether upon the Moon; and neither consisted of any Number of Months of 30 or of any other Number of whole Days; but, if I may be allowed to say so, of *Moons* or *Lunations* only. The first and most apparent distinction of time, was into Days, computed from Sun rising to Sun rising again; and which depended upon the apparent diurnal Motion of the Sun; and in order to keep an exact account of them, the *Chaldeans* reckoned by a Cycle or Period of ten *lesser Neres*, or Days; each of which they subdivided again into 60 *Sesses*. But as they could not but soon observe that the *Moon* regularly decreased in Light from the Full, till at last she totally disappeared; and that as soon as she began to appear again, she as regularly increased in Light to the Full, and so on from full Moon to full Moon without any sensible Variation; I say, since they

they could not but soon observe this, I imagine that they pitched upon these *Lunar Revolutions*, as the next best and most natural *Measure* for keeping a true and perfect account of Time ⁽²⁷⁾. For though the just and exact Length of a *Lunar Synodical Month* might not be then known, nor perhaps for many ages after; yet this could be no Hindrance to their keeping a true and exact Account of the Number of *Moons* or *Lunations* themselves; which was enough for all common Uses.

That *one Sare* consisted of more than one *Lunation*; nay, that it must have consisted of a considerable Number of *Lunations*, is certain: Because *Berosus* allows but 120 *Sares* to his *ten antediluvian Kings*. But of what Number of *Lunations* one *Sare* did consist is not so easy to determine. *Hesychius* and *Suidas* are the only Authors that give us any Light into the Matter. The former in very general Terms: A *Sare*, says he, is a certain Number among the *Babylonians*; Σάρε, 'Αελμός τις παρὰ Βαβυλωνίους; and the latter more fully, thus: Σαρε, Μέτρον ἢ 'Αελμός ὡς Χάλ-

(27) Hence we read in Job Ch. 14. 5. *The Number of his Months* or MOONS (יָסָד) *are with thee*: Ch. 21. 21. *What Pleasure hath he in his House after him, when the Number of his Months* or MOONS (יָסָד) *is cut off in the midst*: Ch. 29. 1, 2. Moreover Job continued his Parable, and said: *Oh that I were as in Months* or MOONS (יָסָד) *pass*.

Χαλδαίοις. οἱ γὰρ οἱ Σάροι ποιεῖσιν ἐνιαυτὸς βσβ,
κατὰ τὴν τῶν Χαλδαίων ψῆφον: εἴπερ ὁ Σάρος
ποιεῖ μῆνας ΣΕΛΗΝΙΑΚΩΝ σκβ. οἱ γίνονται
ἐν ἐνιαυτοῖς, καὶ Μῆνες ἕξ. i. e. *Sari*, apud *Chaldaeos*
est mensura & numerus. Nam 120 Sari faciunt
annos 2222, secundum calculum Chaldaeorum:
Quandoquidem Sarus continet MENSES LU-
NARES 222, qui sunt anni 18 & 6 Menses.
In all the old Editions of *Suidas*, the Words
κατὰ τὴν τῶν Χαλδαίων ψῆφον, εἴπερ ὁ Σάρος
ποιεῖ Μῆνας Σεληνιακῶν σκβ were wanting, till
the most learned and worthy Bishop *Pearson*
in his excellent exposition of the *Creed*, sup-
plied them from a *Manuscript* in the *Vatican*
Library; and accordingly, upon the Authori-
ty of that *Manuscript*, and another in *Paris*,
Mr. *Kuster* in his late beautiful Edition of
Suidas, has restored the whole Passage in the
Manner I have here quoted it. But notwith-
standing these very valuable Corrections, I am
still in doubt, whether the Text is as yet per-
fectly restored; and indeed, whether *Suidas*
himself had a right Idea of these *Sares*. For,
not to insist upon another Remark made by
the learned Bishop; who thinks that *Suidas*
wrote only βσβ, i. e. 2220 Years: because
18 Years and 6 Months multiplied by 120,
amounts to just that Sum: It is evident that
Suidas knew not how to distinguish between
true

true and real Lunar Months or Lunations,
 and Months of 30 Days each; and that for
 want of this Distinction, he is much mistaken
 in making 222 *Lunar Months or Lunations*
 to be equal to 18 Years and 6 Months. For
 upon the Supposition that the *Lunar Synodical*
 Month, at a Medium, consists of 29 Days, 12
 Hours, 44 Minutes and 3 Seconds; if we rec-
 kon by the *Julian Year* of $365 \frac{1}{4}$ Days, and
 allow 30 Days to a Month, it is certain that
 222 *Lunations* amount to no more but 17
 Years, 11 Months, 16 Days and 13 Hours.
 Or, if we reckon by the *Egyptian Year* of
 365 Days, and allow 30 Days to each Month,
 then 222 *Lunations* will amount only to 17
 Years, 11 Months, 20 Days and 19 Hours.
 I am therefore very much inclined to think,
 That the first and last Number in this Pas-
 sage, is of *Suidas's* own making; but whe-
 ther with a View of accommodating *Berosus's*
 120 *Sares* to the Chronology of the *Septuagint*,
 as Mr. *Des Vignoles* suspects, or for what
 other Reason I am not able to guess. And
 all that we can conclude from this Passage
 with any Certainty is only this; That one
Chaldean Sare consisted of a considerable
 Number of *Lunations*; but whether of 222
Lunations exactly, as *Suidas* has it now;
 or of 223 *Lunations*, a Period mentioned by
Pliny,

Pliny (28), Ptolemy (29) and Geminus (30); by Ricciolus (31) called the *Chaldaic Period*; and by an eminent and learned Mathematician (32) of our own, the *Lunar Eclipse-Period*; or of 228 *Lunations*, a Period consisting of 6732 Days, wanting 36 Minutes; or of 230 *Lunations*, a Period consisting of 6792 Days, and 52 Minutes over; or whether Suidas by mistake has put 222 or rather 223 *Lunations* instead of 232 *Lunations* consisting of 6851 days, 2 Hours and 20 Minutes; I say, whether a *Chaldean Sare* consisted of one or other of these Numbers of *Lunations*, or which of them was the Number that Berosus reckoned by, I conceive is hardly possible to be determined with any Certainty at this Distance of Time. And therefore, all that I shall pretend to be positive to is only this; that take which of them you please, it will accord to a sufficient Exactness with the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*; but not at all with that of our present *Masoretic Text*. Now in order to set this in a proper

(28) L. 2. c. 13. (29) Almag. l. 4. c. 2.

(30) *Fixar. πιδ; τὰ φαιν.* c. 15. p. 35.

(31) Almog. Nov. l. 4. c. 19. p. 243.

(32) Egregia autem motuum lunarium Periodus (says Dr. Halley in the Phil. Transact. N^o 194) absolvitur mensibus 223, nempe quâ Luna et ad Solem et ad nodum eundem satis accurate revolvatur, ac parum absit ab eodem ad apogæum suum respectu, atque insuper paucis tantum gradibus ab eodem Cœli puncto distet. Ita ut post intervallum hoc, ECLIPSES revera redeant in Orbem, ac repetito ordine invicem secutæ, tam quantitate, tam cæteris circumstantiis per omnia similes sint.

proper Light, the Reader will give me leave to premise;

1. That the Word Year, which in Latin is called *Annus*, and in Greek *ἐνιαυτός*, means no more but any *circular Revolution* of a thing from a given Point to the same Point again; *Annus*, say the *Etymologists*, *quasi Anus*, i. e. *Anulus*, *quod in se redeat*; *nam ut parvi circuli Anuli, sic magni dicebantur Anni*; and in the same manner *ἐνιαυτός* is as much as to say *ἐν τῷ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἰέναι*, or *quod ἐν ἑαυτῷ redeat*. And so in the Hebrew the Word *שנה* *Annus*, comes from *שנה* *Iteravit*; and so in the *Chaldee*, the Year *שנה*, is so called, as *Buxtorf* observes, *quod ab eodem puncto semper iteretur, et ad primum vestigium redeat*. So that it is manifest that, howsoever latter Ages may have appropriated the Word to signify a *Solar Year*; Yet that it was most probably made use of at first indifferently, either to signify a *Day*, or one *Revolution* of the *Sun* from any given Point of the Heavens to the same Point again (33); or one intire *Lunar Revolution* from one *Full Moon* to another; or from one *New Moon* to another; because these were the

(33) The Author of the *Chronicon Pascale* observes p. 45. that before the ancient *Egyptians* knew how to reckon by Years, they called a Day a Year: *Neque enim tum annos metiri norant Egyptii, sed Dierum Cursus Annos dicebant.* — And again a little lower; *Alius enim omnis numerandi modus tunc temporis ab Egyptiis ignorabatur, cum singulas dierum periodos pro tot Annis putarent.*

the *two first* and *most obvious* *Revolutions* that offered themselves to their Observation. But as the Word might then be more commonly applied to a *Lunar Revolution*, as being much longer than the *Diurnal* *Revolutions* of the Sun; It is not improbable but that when the proper Motion of the Sun came to be discovered, the same Word, for the like Reason, might be more peculiarly appropriated to signify that longer Interval of Time which he takes up in moving from any one given Point of the *Ecliptic* till he returns to the same point again.

2. It is so natural to imagine that the first Ages of the World computed their Years by the *Revolutions* of the *Moon*, that I should think it might go a great way towards satisfying any indifferent Person; but, if to this we add the clear and express Testimonies of several ancient Writers to the same purpose, I humbly apprehend it will set the Matter beyond all manner of Doubt. *Eudoxus* (34) who lived many Years in *Egypt* with *Plato*, and was instructed in the *Egyptian* Learning by the Priests of *Heliopolis*, affirms that οἱ Ἀιγύπτιοι τὸν Μῆνα ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκάλουν (35), that is, that the *Egyptians* called a Month a Year. *Diodorus Siculus* (36) speaking of the incredible Length of the

(34) Strabo Geogr. l. 17. p. 806.

(35) Proclus in Timæum Plat. p. 13.

(36) L. 1. p. 15.

the *Egyptian Antiquities*, observes that in order to account for them, some thought that in ancient Times, before the Sun's Motion was known, Years were reckoned by the Revolutions of the Moon; ἀπίστευ δὲ ὄντι τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἐτῶν, ἐπιχειρήσει τις λέγειν, ὅτι τὸ παλαιόν, ἔπα τῆς περὶ τὸν ἥλιον κινήσεως ἐπεγνωσμένης, σωέβαινε κατὰ τὴν τῆς Σελήνης περίοδον ἀγεῖσθαι τὸν ἘΝΙΑΥΤΟΝ. *Plutarch* in the Life of *Numa* says the same, Ἀιγυπτίοις δὲ Μηνιαῖος ἦν ὁ ἐνιαυτός, ἔτα τέτραμνος; *apud Ægyptios Annus erat menstruus sive Lunaris; deinde quadrimestris. Pliny* (37) speaks full to the same Effect; *Annum enim alii æstate unum determinabant, & alterum Hyeme: alii quadripartitis temporibus, sicut Arcades; quorum anni trimestres fuere: Quidam LUNÆ SBNIO, ut ÆGYPTII: Itaque apud eos aliqui et singula millia annorum vixisse produntur.* And with these agrees *Eusebius* (38), who affirms that the most ancient *Egyptians*, ἐκ παρ' αὐτοῖς παλαιότατοι, reckoned their Years by *Lunar Months*; and the same is likewise expressly affirmed by one of the greatest and most learned of the *Roman Antiquaries*; *At enim Varro*, says *Lactantius* (39), *apud Ægyptios pro annis menses haberi, ut non solis per 12 signa circuitus faciat annum, sed LUNA, quæ orbem*

(37) L. 7. c. 48.

(38) *Apud Syncel.* p. 40.(39) *Divin. Institut.* l. 2. c. 12. p. 102.

orbem illum signiferum 30 dierum spatio illustrat.
 Now these Testimonies being so exprefs, uniform, and full to the Point, I presume I may reasonably conclude that the *Egyptians*, and consequently all the other most ancient Nations did at first reckon their Years by *Lunar Months*; and that the only Mistake which these several *Historians* have been guilty of in Relation to this Matter, is, their not rightly distinguishing between a Period of 30 Days and a *Lunar Month*; or to speaking more properly in supposing that those who reckoned by *Lunar Months* or *Years*, computed them by a certain fixed and determinate Period of 30 whole Days.

3. *Herodotus*, who had travelled into *Egypt*, and conversed familiarly with the Learned of that Country, assures us, that the *Egyptians* were the first that discovered the Solar Year; and distinguished it into 12 Months. *This*, says he (40), *they discovered by the Stars*; and to me they seem to have acted more prudently therein than the *Greeks*. For, the *Greeks* add one Intercalary Month every third Year, on account of the Seasons. But the *Egyptians* to 12 Months of 30 Days each, add five Days every Year; and by that means reckon by a regular and invariable Period of 365 Days. And tho' they

(40) L. 2. §. 4.

they had likewise discovered ⁽⁴¹⁾ that the true Length of the Solar Year exceeds the Number of 365 Days by about 6 Hours; we are nevertheless assured that they wholly neglected the said 6 Hours, and that they reckoned by a Year consisting of 365 Days precisely. *Ægyptii*, says *Geminus* ⁽⁴²⁾, *neque annos agunt secundum Solem, neque menses et dies secundum Lunam; sed propriâ quadam ratione sunt usi. Volunt enim sacrificia diis fieri non secundum idem tempus anni: Sed eâ per omnes anni tempestates ire, & fieri ex æstivo festo & hybernũ & autumnale & verum. Agunt enim annum dierum 365. Duodecim enim menses agunt 30 dierum, & quinque dies epactas addunt. Sed quadrantem Diei non intercalant, propter prædictam causam; ut videlicet illis festa anticipent.* And with this Testimony of *Geminus*, *Censorinus* ⁽⁴³⁾ in his concise way perfectly agrees, *Ægyptiorum annus civilis*, says he, *solos habet dies 365, sine ullo intercalari:* And to the same Effect, *Theo* an excellent Mathematician of *Alexandria*, *Καὶ Ἀργυρίῳς Ἐνιούσιος. χρόν. ἡμερῶν τυγχάνει τῆς μόνον.* i. e. *Annus vero Ægyptiacus constat debus 365 duntaxat* ⁽⁴⁴⁾.

4. At

(41) As appears from *Strabo*, l. 17. p. 806. 816.

(42) *Eisag.* c. 6, p. 19.

(43) *Die Nat.* c. 18. p. 107.

(44) In *Comment.* εἰς τὸς περὶ χρόνου κανόνα.

4. At what Time the *Egyptians* fixed upon this Period of 365 Days for the Length of their Civil Year, is next to impossible to determine with any certainty. That they learned it from *Abraham*, I dare not positively affirm, though some very considerable Writers (45) plainly intimate as much. But if they had it not from that great *Patriarch*; but found it out themselves, as *Herodotus* affirms they did; I conceive it must have been before the Days of *Moses* (46). For, as the *first, easiest* and most *natural* way of keeping an Account of *Time*, seems to have been by *Days, Weeks* and *Moons* or *Lunations*; so I imagine that these were the only *Measures* of Time which the *holy Patriarchal Line* made use of from the Beginning. But that this *greatest* of *Prophets*, as well as *most consummate Statesman* (47), observing the

Con-

(45) Polyhistor. & Eupolemus apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 9. c. 17. p. 418, 419. Syncel. Chronogr. p. 312.

(46) Syncellus (Chronogr. p. 123) mentions it as a Report, that the *Egyptians* reckoned for some time by a Year of 360 Days; and that *Aseth* the 32d King of *Egypt* first added the other 5 Days. Which, if true, it would follow that the Year of 365 Days was first introduced into *Egypt* about 60 Years before *Moses* was born.

(47) Petav. de Doctr. Temp. l. 9. c. 9. p. 13. *Quin illud præterea cogitandum est, non solum ex Moysi verbis, atque ex diluvii descriptione nihil de propria temporis illius anni forma posse concludi; sed etiam licet manifeste mensium, annique totius quantitas ibidem esset expressa, non ideo tamen de anno illo, quo Patriarchæ sub diluvii tempus usi sunt necessario colligi. Hoc enim afferri potest, Mosem eos Menses, atque ejusmodi formam anni ad diluvii exponendam historiam accommodasse, quibus tum Judæorum populus, cum scriberet, utebatur.*

Conveniency of reckoning by Years of 365 Days, changed the way of *measuring Time* by *Days, Weeks* and *Moons* or *Lunations*, which he had received from his Ancestors, to *Days, Months* and *Years*; as we find the same recorded to this Day in his *Divine History* of *Genesis*. But this I submit to be farther enquired into. And all that I think necessary to be observed here is only this; that as there were but *two* sorts of Years, which the first Ages could reckon by, *Lunar* or *Solar*; and as the *Egyptians* are the first that made use of a *Solar Year* of 365 Days, it seems reasonable to conclude, that in the first Ages after, as well as before the Flood, the *Chaldeans* could reckon their Years by no other *Measure* but by *Moons* or *Lunations*; until such time as this Practice of the *Egyptians* was conveyed to, and made use of by them. Now these things being premised, I presume we may very safely conclude upon the whole:

1. If *one Chaldean Sare* be supposed equal to 222 *Lunations*; then 120 *Sares* will be equal to 26640 *Lunations*; and consequently (supposing the *Lunar Synodical Month* at a *Medium*, to consist of 29^d. 12^h. 44[']. 3["]. 10^{'''}. 30^{'''}.) to 2155 *Egyptian Years*, and 4 *Months*, wanting 30 *Minutes*.

2. If

2. If one Chaldean Sare be supposed equal to 223 Lunations; then 120 Sares will be equal to 26760 Lunations; and consequently to 2165 Egyptian Years, 13 Days, 15 Hours and 36 Minutes.

3. If one Chaldean Sare be supposed equal to 230 Lunations; then 120 Sares will amount unto 27600 Lunations; and consequently to 2232 Egyptian Years, 12 Months, 4 Days, 8 Hours and 21 Minutes; or within 15 Hours and 39 Minutes of 2233 Egyptian Years.

4. If one Chaldean Sare be supposed to consist of 232 Lunations; then 120 Sares will amount unto 27840 Lunations; and consequently to 2252 Egyptian Years, 8 Months, 1 Day, 16 Hours and 33 Minutes.

5. And lastly; If we suppose one Chaldean Sare to consist of $232\frac{1}{2}$ Lunations; then 120 Sares will amount unto 27880 Lunations; and consequently to 2255 Egyptian Years, 7 Months, 26 Days, 9 Hours and 11 Minutes.

Now it being evident on one hand that none of these Numbers can possibly be reconciled to the Chronology of our present Masoretic Text; and on the other that the highest of them agrees exactly with the Septuagint; and that the lowest of them does not differ more from the Septuagint, than even some Hebrew Copies do from others; Does not this make it

G extremely

extremely probable that *Berosus* reckoned by *Lunar Years*? and that his *Chronology*, when rightly understood, is perfectly consistent with that of the *Septuagint*?

If we were sure that the *ten Antediluvian Kings* mentioned by *Berosus*, were of the Race of *Cain*, as the most learned Bishop *Cumberland*, and Mr. Professor *Fourmont* contend, I should then prefer the first Number of 2155 Years; because I find that there was an old Tradition among the *Jews* (48), that *Cain* murdered *Abel* in the 99th Year of the World; and if we may suppose that in about 2 Years after this, *Cain* might set up for himself, and thereby lay the Foundation for that Succession of wicked Princes, which began in himself, and which continued to disturb the World from that time to the Deluge, the Number of 2155 Years will agree exactly with the same.

But to speak my own Opinion freely, I am more inclined to think that *Berosus's ten Antediluvian Kings*, were the same with the *ten Mosaiical Antediluvian Patriarchs*; that he computed by a *Sare* of $232 \frac{1}{2}$ *Lunations*; and that he reckoned from the *Creation* to the *Flood* 2256 Years exactly as the *Septuagint* do. And therefore in the next Section, I will endeavour

(48) Apud Syncel. p. 9.

deavour to lay before the Reader in as succinct a manner as I can, the reasons which induce me to think so.

S E C T. II.

Of the Egyptian Antiquities.

SYNCELLUS informs us in one place ⁽¹⁾ that *Berosus* and *Manetho* began (what he calls) their several monstrous Reckonings from one and the same Epocha or Year ⁽²⁾; and in another ⁽³⁾, that *Manetho* was led into great Mistakes by following an old *Egyptian Chronicle*, which ascribed to the Gods a Reign of no less than 33984 Years. *Syncellus* exclaims very much against this prodigious Number of Years; and herein he has been closely followed

G 2

by

(1) Pag. 17.

(2) *Scaliger's* Observation upon this is somewhat remarkable; *Georgius*, says he, ait *Berosum* & *Manethonem* tanquam ex compaſſo ab EODEM ANNO fabuloſorum Regum ſuorum initia exorſos eſſe; θαυμαζέτω δὲ πῶς ἐκ ἡσυχύθησαν (ὁ Βηρωσάδης, καὶ ὁ Μανηθαῖς) ἀπ' ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους ΑΡΧΗΝ θέσαι τὰς τρεκαίδεσσιν αὐτῶν ἐνυστερααῖς, &c. Hæc quanquam in dubium merito revocari poſſunt, propter prodigioſa vetuſtatis & longiſſimi temporis curricula, tam Chaldaica *Beroſi*, quam *Ægyptiaca* *Manethonis*, tamen non ſolum retinenda ſunt, ſed etiam in pretio habenda propter Reverentiam vetuſtatis; tum etiam, quia medii temporis vera cum illis fabuloſis continuantur. Not. in Græc. Euf. Pag. 408. And again a little lower; ſpeaking of *Manetho's* Work, *Primus Tomus*, ſays he, τῇ Θεῶν καὶ ἡμικίων διαſεεία δικα-
tus erat, & præterea rerum principia continebat; atque ab EODEM ANNO *Ægyptiaca ſua* *Manethos*, a QUO ſua *Chaldaica* & *Babylonica Beroſus*, deducebat. p. 411.

(3) Pag. 51.

by all our *Chronologers* ever since; who to a Man reject this Number of Years as altogether *fabulous*. But with all due Respect to *Syncellus*, I am strongly inclined to think that there is more Truth couched under this Number of Years than he was aware of (4). For, let us but suppose that these Years were *Lunar Years*,

(4) Vetus enim quædam Chronographica descriptio fertur apud Ægyptios, *says Syncellus* (pag. 51, 52.) quæ Manethonem in errorem inductum existimo, quæque triginta principatuum per generationum 113 seriem immenso quodam temporis spatio, annorum videlicet Myriadum trium, et 6525 distributionem complectitur: Ac primo quidem *Auritarum*, secundo *Mesæorum*, ac demum Ægyptiorum Narrationem, hæc fere modo instituit.

Deorum Regnum juxta vetus Chronicon.

Vulcani tempus, quod interdum nocturne appareat, haud assignatur. *Sol* vulcani filius Myriadibus annorum tribus regnavit. Tum *Saturnus*, inquit, ac reliqui duodecim *Dii* Regnum tenuerunt Annis 3984. Deinde *Semidei* Reges fuerunt octo, Annis 217. Post hos familiæ (γεῖναι) quindecim Cynici Circuli receptæ sunt Annis 443. Mox *Tanitarum* Principatus 16 Generationibus (γενεῶν) 8. Annis 190 Stetit. Cui 17 Principatus *Memphitarum*, familiarum 4. Annis 103 accessit: Hosque Principatus *Memphitarum* 18. familiarum 14. Annis 348 secutus est: Postmodum *Diospolitarum* 19 Principatus, familiarum 5, Annis 194. Ac tum Principatus 20. *Diospolitarum*, familiarum 8. Annorum 228. Mox etiam Principatus 21 *Tanitarum*, familiarum 6, Annis 121. Insuper Principatus 22 *Tanitarum*, familiarum 3. Annis 48. Ad hæc, Principatus 23 *Diospolitarum*, familiarum 2. Annis 19. Posthæc Principatus 24. *Saitarum*, familiarum 3. Annis 44. His adjungitur Principatus 25. *Æthiopum*, familiarum 3. Annis 44. Quibus successit Principatus 26. *Memphitarum*, familiarum 7, Annis 177. Successit 27 Principatus *Perfarum* 5. Annis 124. - - - - His addendus 29 Principatus *Tanitarum*, Generationum - - - - Annis 39. Quibus tanquam cumulus accedit 30 Principatus *Tanitarum* unius Annis 18. Then follow *Syncellus's Remarks*, which plainly discover that he never enter'd into the true Meaning of these Numbers. Summa principatuum triginta, *says he*, est 36525 Annorum: qui quinquies et vigesies in 1461 resoluti et distributi decantatum indicant Græcorum et Ægyptiorum fabulis Zodiaci in primum Statum reparationem, &c.

Years, or Lunations; and the whole Mystery is cleared up at once. For, 33984 Lunations are equal to 2749 Egyptian Years, 6 Months, 2 Days, 15 Hours and 34 Minutes. Now if we neglect the odd Months, Days, Hours and Minutes; And if from 2749 Years we subtract 2256 the Number of Years from the Creation to the Flood; there will remain 493 Years; when the Reign of the 12 Egyptian GODS, that is of the first 12 Patriarchs from Adam to Arphaxad, ceased: For according to the Chronology of the Septuagint, in the very next Year, that is in the 494th Year after the Flood, Nimrod and his Adherents, who had formed that monstrous Design of building a Tower whose Top should reach unto Heaven, rebelled against Sem and Arphaxad their lawful Princes, and consequently put an End to the Reign of the Gods on Earth, that is, to the Reign of the Princes of the holy Patriarchal Line over the whole Race of Mankind (5).

I shall

(5) Monfr. Michel was therefore mistaken in thinking that the Chronology of the LXX before the Flood, might safely enough be rejected, as being of no Use to explain the profane Antiquities antecedent thereto. Comme l'addition de 600 Ans que les septante font dans l'interval depuis la Creation jusqu'au Deluge, ne s'accorde ni avec le Texte Hebreu, ni avec le Samaritain, on peut la rejeter, d'autant mieux qu'elle est inutile pour expliquer les Antiquités Profanes d'avant le deluge. System Chronol. sur les trois Textes de la Bible p. 7.

I shall only add, that as *Syucellus* seems to have mistaken the true Meaning of the ancient *Egyptian Chronicle*, with regard to the Reign of their 12 *Gods*; I cannot but likewise suspect that, for want of a competent Knowledge in *Astronomy*, he has also misrepresented their Meaning with respect to their *Grand Period* of upwards of 36000 Years; to which I am inclined to think they confined the Reigns both of their *Gods* and *Demi-Gods*. *They reckon*, says he, *by a Period 36525 Years*. But why by such a Period? Because *Ptolemy* made use of a Period of 25 Years; and 1461 Years multiplied by 25, produce 36525. Now *Ptolemy*, I own, had good Reason for making use of a Period of 25 Years; because, as in 19 *Julian Years*, there are precisely 235 *Lunations*, and only 1 Hour and 27 Minutes over; so in 25 *Egyptian Years*, there are precisely 309 *Lunations*, and only 1 Hour and 7 Minutes over. But what should induce the *Egyptians* in those most ancient Times, to multiply such a Period by 1461? Because 1461 *Egyptian Years* are equal to 1460 *Julian Years*? Surely that could not be a Reason with them; to whom neither the *Julian Year*, no, nor even the *Sothiac* or *Canicular Period* of 1460 Years were as yet known. The Truth of

of the Matter therefore, I take to be this: The *Grand Egyptian Period*, that is, the whole Duration of the Reigns of the *Gods* and *Demi-Gods*, according to their Account, consisted perhaps, not of 36525 Years, as *Syncellus* imagines, but of 36524 Years or *Lunations*. For 36524 *Lunations* being reduced to *Egyptian Years*, make 2955 Years precisely, with only a Fraction of 8 *Hours* and 28 *Minutes*, which in so long a Course of Time might safely enough be neglected. And if from this Sum, we deduct 2749 Years for the Reigns of their 12 *Gods* as beforementioned, there will remain for the Reigns of the 8 *Demi-Gods* who succeeded next to them, not 217 Years, as *Syncellus* has it in one Place (7), nor 214 Years, as he has it in another (8), but 206 Years. And this I take to be the precise Number of Years, which they reckoned from the time that their Ancestors withdrew their Obedience from their lawful Princes, in the Plains of *Shinar*, to the compleat Settlement of their Government in *Egypt* under *Menes* (9): who, being the first that reigned after the

(7) Pag. 51.

(8) Pag. 41.

(9) Extra controversiam positum est, (says the most learned Sir J. Marsham in his *Chronological Canon*. p. 22.) Menem fuisse primum *Ægypti* Regem, πρῶτον πασὶ βασιλεύσαι τῆς Αἰγύπτου Μηνᾶν. Hoc Herodotus & Diodorus Siculus; hoc Eratosthenes, & ex Manethone, Africanus, Eusebius, Syncellus Uno ore prædicant.

Demi-Gods, was therefore considered by after-Ages, as the first Founder of the Egyptian Monarchy.

If I may be indulged in this Conjecture; it will then follow that the beginning of the Reign of *Menes* over Egypt, must be placed, not *A. M.* 2776, as *Syncellus* has it in one place ⁽¹⁰⁾; nor, 124 Years after, or *Ann. Mund.* 2900, as he has it in another ⁽¹¹⁾; but *Anno Mundi* 2956. And what seems to me to countenance this last *Epocha* more than either of the other two is this: *Diodorus Siculus* informs us ⁽¹²⁾, that *Menes* and his Posterity reigned MORE than 1400 Years: And *Josephus* ⁽¹³⁾ seems to intimate not only that *Menes* flourished many Years before *Abraham*, but likewise that the Princes of his Line failed in the Days of *Solomon*, after they had governed Egypt for MORE than 1300 Years (πλείονα ἐτῶν τετρακοσίων ἢ χίλων) or rather (if I may be allowed to correct *Josephus* by *Diodorus*) πλείονα ἐτῶν τετρακοσίων ἢ χίλων for MORE than 1400 Years. Now according to the *Chronology* of the *Septuagint*, *Abraham* was born *An. Mund.* 3328; and I have shewn before ⁽¹⁴⁾, that from the Birth of *Abraham* to the Reign of *Solomon* *Josephus*

(10) *Chronograph.* p. 53. 91. 210. (11) *Ibid.* p. 91. 147.

(12) *L. 1. p. 29.*

(13) *L. 8. c. 6. §. 2. p. 355.*

(14) *Dissert.* p. 67.

Josephus reckons 1094 Years. *Solomon* therefore according to him, began to reign *Anno Mundi* 4422. Now if from this sum you subtract any Number of Years more than 1400, as for Example, 1405 Years, it will carry us up to the last Year of the Reign of *Menes*, viz. *Anno Mundi* 3017. But as the *Phrase* MORE than 1400 Years, will allow us to pitch upon any Number of Years between 1400 and 1500, if we pitch upon 1466 Years; and subtract the same from the Year of the World, in which *Solomon* began to reign, viz. *A. M.* 4422; it will carry us back to the Year of the World 2956; the very Year in which I have, by the help of the old *Egyptian Chronicle*, placed the the Beginning of Reign of *Menes*.

Here I might take my leave of this Subject: My main Design being only to illustrate the first two Periods from the *Creation* to the *Flood*; and from thence to the *Birth* of *Abraham*, by shewing how consistent the *Chronology* of the *LXX* for those early Times, is, with the *Antiquities* of the *Chaldeans* and *Egyptians*, the only two Nations who have ever pretended to any authentic Accounts of such remote Ages. But, in regard that the *Egyptian Dynasties* have hitherto greatly perplexed all our most eminent *Chronologers* (15), I hope the Reader will forgive

(15) *The most learned Marsham, who has taken more Pains upon this Subject than any Man besides, cannot help expressing himself*

give me, if I take the Liberty, before I conclude, to offer a few short Remarks on that Subject, *ex abundanti*; and that not only in order to demonstrate the exact Conformity between those *Dynasties* and the *Chronology* of the LXX; but likewise to rescue a most valuable Piece of ancient History from the Hands of those, who would either totally destroy the Credit thereof; or, which is little better, from those who are for *Chopping and Changing*, and *altering and torturing* of them, in order to suit this or that *favourite Notion or Hypothesis* of their own.

By the Help of the old *Egyptian Chronicle* above-mentioned, we have been enabled to discover, that *Menes* began to reign in *Egypt*,
Anno

self thus; Illud autem maximam hominum admirationem excitat, quod eam in conditionem res redacta sit, ut cum cæterarum ple-
 ramque gentium Origines maneat sint & ἀδυνα, Ægyptiacarum
 supersit ingens πλεονασμός, tantaque successionum redundantia,
 quanta ad intelligentiam popularem accommodari nequeat. Un-
 de evenit, ut quæ plurimæ Ægypti Dynastiæ, tanquam fabulosa,
 & ex inscitia, vel insanâ Vetusstatis κακοῦνλια, natæ rejician-
 tur: Neque quisquam inter tot veteres recentioresque temporum em-
 endatores, adhuc repertus sit, qui errori huic subvenerit. Chronic.
 Can. pag. 8. And to the like Effect, the Right Reverend and
 Most Learned Bishop Stillingfleet; as to the Egyptian Dynasties of
 Manetho, I doubt we must be fain to take the same Course that
 Eusebius did with the Chaldean; μὴ συμβιβάζειν τὸ ψεῦδος
 τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, not to trouble ourselves overmuch in seeking to re-
 concile FABLES to TRUTH. Great Pains is taken by some
 very learned Men to reduce the disorderly Dynasties of Manetho to
 some probable Account; but I must confess, upon an impartial Exa-
 mination of them, that I think they have striven, if not to make an
 Ethiopian white, yet an Egyptian to speak Truth concerning his own
 Country, which are almost of an equal Impossibility. Orig. Sacr.
 Book 1. ch. 5. §. 5. pag. 54. Ed. Cambr. 1702.

Anno Mundi 2956. Now the same *Chronicle*, which *Syncellus* owns *Manetho* followed (16), will furnish us with a *Clue*, which, in my humble Opinion, will lead us with great Ease and Safety thro' all the Mazes of this intricate *Labyrinth*. According to *Syncellus*, the noble *Historian* divided his Work into 30 *Dynasties*, beginning with *Menes*, and ending about 15 Years before the Death of *Philip* the Father of *Alexander* the Great. Now if we compute the Length of this Interval, according to the *LXX*, *Josephus* and *Ptolemy's Canon*, the Account will stand thus;

	<i>An. Mund.</i>	Years.	Total.
From the Beginning of the Reign of <i>Menes</i> ,	2956	}	373 373
To the Birth of <i>Abraham</i> - - - - -	3328		
From the Birth to the Call of <i>Abraham</i> -	3403	75	448
From the Call to the Exodus - - - - -	3833	430	878
From the Exod. to the Temple - - - - -	4425	592	1470
From the Building to the Destruction of the	} 4895	470	1940
Temple - - - - -			
From the Destr. of the Temple to <i>Cyrus</i> -	4965	70	2010
From <i>Cyrus</i> to the 15 Year before <i>Alexander</i>	5153	188	2198

And hence it appears that the 30 *Dynasties* of *Manetho* comprehended the History only of about 2198 Years, and no more.

In the next place, the Reader will be pleased to observe, that the *old Egyptian Chronicle*

H 2

agrees,

(16) *Scaliger*, as Mr. *Shuckford* well observes (*Connect. Vol.* 3. p. 220.) imagined that this *old Chronicle* was nothing but an Abridgment of *Manetho*: but taking it either way, it must be allowed to be a Fragment of great Authority.

agrees, I may say, exactly with this Account. For, after the *Gods* and *Demi-Gods*, next follow the Reigns of 15 Kings or Generations for the space of 443 Years; and then 15 *Dynasties* who succeeded one after another for the space of 1703 Years; and both together amount to the Sum of 2146 Years, which comes so very near to the Reckoning of the LXX; that I believe such another Instance of any two or more *old Historians* of different *Ages* and *Countries* agreeing so nearly with one another, for so long a Course of Years, can hardly be produced.

But in regard that the old Chronicle computed 113 Generations in all from the *Demi-Gods* to the End of the 30th *Dynasty*; whereas, according to our present Copies, the whole Number amounts only to 84 Generations; and the Number of *Generations* and Years in the 28th *Dynasty*: And likewise the Number of Generations in the 29th *Dynasty* are wanting; it is evident that this *most valuable Fragment of Antiquity* has suffered greatly under the Hands of Transcribers: And therefore, if we may be allowed to supply these Defects, and to rectify some other Mistakes from *Africanus* and *Eusebius*; then both Lists will stand thus;

The

The *Old Chronicle* as it stands
in *Syncellus*, pag. 51, 52.

			Yrs.
	15 Generations	--	443
16 Dyn.	8 Tanites	190	633
17 Dyn.	4 Memph.	103	736
18 Dyn.	14 Memph.	348	1084
19 Dyn.	5 Diospol.	194	1278
20 Dyn.	8 Diospol.	228	1506
21 Dyn.	6 Tanites.	121	1627
22 Dyn.	3 Tanites.	48	1675
23 Dyn.	2 Diospol.	19	1694
24 Dyn.	3 Saïtes.	44	1738
25 Dyn.	3 Æthiop.	44	1782
26 Dyn.	7 Memph.	177	1959
27 Dyn.	5 Pers. --	124	2083
28 Dyn.	-----	-----	-----
29 Dyn.	-----	39	2122
30 Dyn.	1 Diospol.	18	2140

Add for the 28 Dyn. 6. 2146

84 Generations 2146 Yrs.

The *Old Chronicle* corrected from
Africanus and *Eusebius*.

			Yrs.
	15 Generations	--	443
16 Dyn.	8 Tanites.	190	633
17 Dyn.	5 Memph.	103	736
18 Dyn.	16 Memph.	348	1084
19 Dyn.	5 Diospol.	194	1278
20 Dyn.	12 Diospol.	228	1506
21 Dyn.	7 Tanites.	121	1627
22 Dyn.	9 Tanites.	48	1675
23 Dyn.	4 Diospol.	89	1764
24 Dyn.	3 Saïtes	44	1808
25 Dyn.	3 Æthiop.	44	1852
26 Dyn.	9 Memph.	177	2029
27 Dyn.	8 Pers. --	124	2153
28 Dyn.	1 Saïte.	6	2159
29 Dyn.	5 Mend.	21	2180
30 Dyn.	3 Diospol.	18	2198

113 Generations 2198 Yrs.

Now these Corrections being made, not arbitrarily and to serve an *Hypothesis*, but by the help of *Africanus* and *Eusebius*'s Lists of *Manetho*'s 30 *Dynasties*, still to be seen in *Syncellus*, I know not what should hinder us from inferring that, in all Probability, the 113 Generations, mentioned in the *old Egyptian Chronicle*, comprehended the Space of 2198 Years; and consequently that it agreed to a surprising *Exactness* with the *Computations* of the LXX and *Josephus*.

And

And since it further appears, by comparing the one with the other, that the 15 *Dynasties* in the *old Chronicle*, are the same with the last 15 *Dynasties* of *Manetho*; due Allowance being made for *Interpolations*, either by *Manetho* himself, or by *Africanus* or *Eusebius*; and for other Errors of Transcribers; I submit it whether we may not very safely conclude upon the whole,

1. That the whole Time from the Beginning of the Reign of *Menes* to the Beginning of the 16th *Dynasty* of *Manetho*, amounted to no more but 443 Years, beginning *Anno Mundi* 2956, or *Anno post Diluvium* 700; and ending *Anno Mundi* 3398; or *Anno post Diluvium* 1142; and consequently that many of the first 15 *Dynasties* of *Manetho* were collateral and Cotemporary with one another.

2. That the 15 Kings or Generations, mentioned all together in one Article in the *old Chronicle*, are probably the same with the first 15 *Theban Kings* in *Eratosthenes's* Catalogue: For, I find that they likewise reigned 443 Years precisely.

3. That *Sesostris*, the third Prince of the 12th *Dynasty*, according to *Manetho*, flourished before the *Call* of *Abraham*. For, according to the Principles here laid down, the 16th *Dynasty* of *Manetho* began *Anno Mundi* 3398; or
Anno

Anno post Diluvium 1142; and *Abraham* was not Called till the 1147th Year after the Flood.

4. That the *Shepherds* or *Pastors*, were settled in *Egypt* before the Call of *Abraham*; and were not expelled from thence till about 73 Years after *Jacob* went down with his Family to settle in that Country. For the first Account that we meet with of the *Shepherds*, is in the 15th *Dynasty* of *Manetho*; and according to the same Author, they likewise compose the 16th and 17th *Dynasties*, amounting both together to 296 Years, or according to the *old Chronicle*, to 293 Years: So that they continued in *Egypt* to the Year of the World 3691; or to the 1435th Year after the Flood. But *Jacob* went down into *Egypt* 215 Years after the Call of *Abraham*, That is *Anno post Diluvium* 1362; and consequently about 73 Years before the Expulsion of the *Shepherds*.

5. That in all Probability *Bæon*, one of the *Shepherd Kings* and the 2^d Prince of the 17th *Dynasty*, was that *Pbaraah*, to whom *Joseph* foretold the 7 Years of *Plenty*, and the next succeeding 7 Years of *Famine*. For according to the *old Chronicle*, the 17th *Dynasty* began *Anno Mundi* 3588, and according to the LXX, *Jacob* went down into *Egypt*, *Anno Mundi*

Mundi 3618; and 9 Years before this, *Joseph* interpreted *Pharaoh's Dreams*, that is, *Anno Mundi* 3609. Now according to *Eusebius*, *Saites*, or, as *Josephus* writes the Name, *Salatis*, was the first Prince of the 17th *Dynasty*; and reigned 19 Years. He therefore began to Reign *Anno Mundi* 3588; and died *Anno Mundi* 3607. Upon the Death of *Salatis*, probably there might be some *Commotion* or *Conspiracy* formed to shake off the Yoke of the *Shepherd Kings*; and thereupon *Bæon* the new King imprisoned two of his Chief Officers, as we read in *Genesis* Chap. XL; and whose Dreams *Joseph* interpreted in the Prison. Two Years after this *Bæon* himself dreamed two Dreams, which none of the *Egyptians* could interpret; and thereupon the Chief Baker informed *Pharaoh*, how *Joseph* had interpreted his Dream, and also that of the other Officer, and by this means *Joseph* was fetched out of Prison; interpreted *Bæon's* Dreams; and in consequence thereof was set over all the Land of *Egypt*, *Anno Mundi* 3609; just 9 Years before *Jacob* went down into *Egypt*. All which agrees perfectly well with the *holy Scriptures* and with *Manetho*. For according to *Manetho* (17), the *Shepherd Kings* were then in Possession of *Memphis*; both the Lower and Upper *Egypt*.

(17) Apud Joseph. c. Apion. p. 1337.

Egypt was become Tributary to them; they had put Garrisons into all the most proper Places, and had taken especial Care to fortify the eastern Frontier of *Egypt* against the *Assyrians*, who were at that time the most powerful People; and from whom they had the most to fear⁽¹⁸⁾. And as the Court of *Bæon* at

(18) The Author of a late celebrated Work, intituled *The Chronology of ancient Kingdoms amended*, (which I would fain persuade my self, has been falsely father'd upon one of the greatest Geniuses of this, or perhaps of any other Age, for *Mathematical Learning*) asserts, that the *Canaanites* who fled from *Joshua*, reigned in *Egypt* under *Salatis*, *Bæon*, *Apachnas*, &c. until the Days of *Eli* and *Samuel*; (Pag. 9, 10, 198, 201, 205.) that these were the Shepherds mentioned in the ancient Histories of *Egypt*; and that *Misphragmuthosis* made a lasting War upon them, and caused many of them to fly into *Palestine*, *Idumea*, *Syria* and *Lybia*; and under *Lelex*, *Æzeus*, *Inachus*, *Pelasgus*, *Æolus* the first, *Cecrops* and other Captains into *Greece*, (*Ibid.*); that *Osiris*, *Bacchus* and *Sesostris* were one and the same King of *Egypt*; and that he could be no other than that *Sesac* who came up against *Jerusalem* in the 5th Year of *Rehoboam* (Ch. 2. p. 193.); that *Ammon* and *Rhea*, *Osiris* and *Isis*, *Orus* and *Bubaste*; and their Secretary *Thoth*; and Generals *Hercules* and *Pan*; and Admiral *Japetus*, *Neptune* or *Typhon*, flourished all after the Expulsion of those *Cannanitish* Shepherds (Pag. 202.); that, when *Joseph* entertained his Brethren, *Egypt* was under the Command of the *Genuin Egyptians*, and not under that of the *Shepherds*, Pag. 203. That according to *Mānetbo*, the *Shepherds* were driven out of *Egypt* only a little before the building of the Temple of *Solomon*, Pag. 204, 205. That in or about the Days of *David*, the *Egyptians* began to observe the Positions of the Stars, and the Length of the Solar Year, Pag. 208; that their old Year was the *Luni-Solar Year* derived from *Noah* to all his Posterity 'till those Days, and consisted of 12 Months, each of 30 Days according to their *Calendar*; and that to the end of this *Calendar Year*, they now added 5 Days, and thereby made up the *Solar Year* of 12 Months and 5 Days, or 365 Days, *ibid.* that the *Edomites* who fled from *David*, with their young King *Hadad* into *Egypt*, carried thither also the Use of Letters, Pag. 209; that *Menes*, who according to all Historians reigned in *Egypt* next after the Gods, lived and reigned after the Expulsion of

at that time, probably consisted of a Mixture of *Shepherds* and *Egyptians*, we may easily see the reason; not only, why *Joseph* directed his Brethren to say that they were *Shepherds*, and to desire leave to settle in the Land of *Goshen* at as great a Distance from the *original Egyptians* as they could; and why *Joseph* insisted so much upon his Brethren being *Spies*; but likewise, why he sat himself at one Table; and provided another for his Brethren; and a third for the *Egyptians*: For the first certainly well became him, as the first Officer of the Kingdom, and the next in Dignity to *Pharaoh* himself; and the other two Tables might be provided, out of a Principle of Civility and good Manners, and to avoid giving any Offence to such of the *Native Egyptians* as might be then of the Company. And if it be farther considered that *Joseph* lived but 71 Years after this, and consequently that he died *Anno Mundi* 3689; only about two Years before the *Expulsion*

the *Canaanitish Shepherds*, Pag. 238, 239, 242; that *Sesostris* reigned in the Age of the Gods of *Egypt*, being deified by the Names of *Osiris*, *Hercules*, and *Bacchus*; and that therefore *Menes*, *Nitocris*, and *Mæris* are to be placed after him, Pag. 245, 246. Now can it be supposed that these and a thousand more equally precarious and ill-grounded Notions and Assertions, scattered and dispersed here and there all over this Work, could possibly fall from the accurate and masterly Pen of Sir *Isaac Newton*? Can it be imagined that he who always treated the most abstruse Subjects in a manner clear and convincing beyond Example; could treat the Chronology of ancient Kingdoms in a manner so loose and confused, so arbitrary and ill-supported? *Credat Judæus Apella!*

pulsion of the *Shepherds*, and the Restoration of the ancient Egyptian Government under their own *natural Princes*, we shall no longer wonder, either how the *Egyptians* came to forget *Joseph* so soon; nor yet why they treated the *Israelites* so ill afterwards as they did. For, it is not only literally true, that upon this great Revolution, there arose up a new King over *Egypt*, who knew not *Joseph*; but it is likewise very probable, that ever after this, they hated and persecuted the Children of *Israel*, as thinking them more inclined to favour their old Friends the *Shepherds* than their new Masters (19), the original Inhabitants of the Country.

6. That upon the *Expulsion* of the *Shepherds*, *Aseth* the first Prince of the 18th Dynasty, and probably a Descendant of *Menes*, took Possession of the Royal Cities, *Memphis* and *Tanis*, and of all the Lower *Egypt*; which his Posterity

I 2

accord-

(19) According to our present Copies of *Josephus*, (l. 2. c. 9. p. 73.) the *Egyptians* persecuted the *Israelites* 400 Years; $\chi\epsilon\tau\iota\epsilon\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma\iota\omega\upsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\omega\iota\omega\upsilon\chi\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\delta\iota\eta\nu\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\pi\omega\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$: *Et quidem per annos quadringentos has perpeffi sunt miseriae*; which being absolutely inconsistent with what *Josephus* afterwards asserts (l. 2. c. 15. p. 88.) viz. That the Children of *Israel* continued in *Egypt* in all but 215 Years; Some have thought, that instead of $\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma\iota\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, *Josephus* wrote $\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon\kappa\omicron\iota\alpha$; and others that he wrote $\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\upsilon\iota\omega\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omega\iota\omega\chi\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$; but the true Reading I take to be this, $\chi\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ (συ) $\omega\phi\epsilon\tau\omega\iota\omega\chi\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$, &c. i. e. That the *Egyptians* persecuted the *Israelites* 140 Years; for so many Years there are precisely between the Expulsion of the *Shepherd Kings* and the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*.

accordingly continued to govern for many Generations afterwards. *Africanus* and *Eusebius*, 'tis true, have left *Afeth* out of their Catalogues of the *Dynasties* : But since *Syncellus* ⁽²⁰⁾ is positive that he was the first of the 18th *Dynasty*, and the Father of *Amos* or *Amosis* ; since he is placed the 32^d in the list of the *Egyptian Kings* ; and *Amosis* or *Tethmosis* is there made his immediate Successor ⁽²¹⁾, and since all this agrees perfectly well with other Circumstances, I conceive the positive Testimony of *Syncellus* upon this Occasion ought not to be disputed.

7. That the Children of *Israel*, under the Conduct of *Moses*, departed out of *Egypt* in the last Year of *Misphragmuthosis*, or *Amosis* the Second of that Name. For, the *Exodus* happened 215 Years after *Jacob* went down into *Egypt*, *Anno post Diluvium* 1577 ; and consequently 141 Years after the *Expulsion* of the *Shepherds* by *Afeth*, the first Prince of the 18th *Dynasty*. For *Afeth*, according to *Syncellus* ⁽²²⁾, reigned 20 Years ; *Amos* or *Amosis* his Son 26 Years ; *Chebro* 13 Years ; *Amenophthis* 21 Years ; *Amerfis* 22 Years ; *Misaphris* 13 Years ; and *Misphragmuthosis*, or *Amosis* the Second, who perished in the *Red-Sea*, 26 Years ; in all 141 Years.

8. That

(20) Pag. 68.

(21) Syncel. p. 123.

(22) Pag. 68.

8. That *Josephus* was in the right in saying that the Flight of *Danaus*, the Brother of *Sethos* or *Ægyptus*, happened about 393 Years, after the *Expulsion* of the *Shepherds*. For, supposing the Flight of *Danaus* to have happened in the 45th Year of *Sethos*'s Reign, which according to the *old Chronicle* answers to the Year of the World 4084; if from this Number we subtract the Year of the World 3691, when the 18th Dynasty began, and the *Shepherds* were expelled, there will remain exactly 393 Years. And if from 393 Years, you subtract the first 45 Years of *Sethos*'s Reign, who was the first Prince of the 19th Dynasty, there remains 348 Years, for the Length of the 18th Dynasty, as the *old Chronicle* has it. I wish *Josephus* had been as careful to distinguish between the *Expulsion* of the *Shepherds* and the Departure of his *Ancestors* out of *Egypt*.

9. That the famous *Sothiac* or *Canicular* Period of the *Egyptians* began in the 19th Year of *Amenophthis* the third Prince of the 19th Dynasty, *Anno Mundi* 4179 or 347 Years after the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*. For, reckoning from the *Creation* to *Menes* 2955 Years; from *Menes* to *Cyrus* 2010 Years as before; from *Cyrus* to the Subversion of the *Persian Monarchy* by *Alexander* the Great 206 Years; and from thence to the Birth of our

our Blessed Saviour (*Anno Urbis Conditæ* 750) 329 Years; the total amounts to 5500 Years; to which if we add 3 Years to the *Vulgar Æra*, and from thence 136 Years, to the first Year of the *second Canicular Period*, as Mr. *Des Vignoles* ⁽²³⁾ has stated the same from *Censorinus*, the whole Number of Years from the *Creation* to the first Year of the *second Period* will amount unto 5639 Years. Now if from this Sum, we subtract 1460 Years, the Length of one whole Period, there will remain 4179 Years. The first *Canicular Period* therefore began *Anno Mundi* 4179. And if from this Year we again subtract 3832 the Number of Years from the *Creation* to the *Exodus*; there will remain 347 Years from the *Exodus* to the first Year of the *first Canicular* or *Sothiac Period* of the *Egyptians*; or excluding both Extremes 345 Years: which agrees exactly with the Number preserved to this Day in *Clemens Alexandrinus* ⁽²⁴⁾. I know that Mr. *Des Vignoles* has made a very different Use of this Passage of *Clem. Alexandrinus*; for he would have it, that he wrote neither 347 nor 345 Years; but 325 Years; and that these Years consisted only of 360 Days each. But as this Emendation is made with no other View but only to make it suit with a *new Hypothesis* of his own; and since

(23) Chronol. de l'Hist. Sainte l. 3. c. 1. (24) Strom. 1. p. 335.

since it appears farther from the very Testimony which he cites from *Syncellus* to prove that the *Egyptians* first reckoned by a Year of 360 Days, and afterwards by a Year of 365 Days; that the Addition of the said 5 Days was made in the Time of *Aseth*, above 140 Years before the *Exodus*; and consequently more than 480 Years before the *first Sothiac Period* commenced; all his pretty *Calculations*, upon this occasion, terminate in nothing but mere *Amusement*.

10. That the sacking of *Troy* happened in the 153^d Year of the 20th *Dynasty*; 554 Years after the *Exodus*; 38 Years before the Foundation of the Temple of *Solomon*; and 1114 Years before the Birth of our Blessed Lord, *An. V. C. 750*. For, according to *Manetho* and *Josephus*, *Danaus* fled into *Greece*, in the 45th Year of *Sethos*, *Sethosis* or *Ægyptus*; *Anno Mundi* 4084. And the *Parian Marbles* now at *Oxford*, reckon from the time that *Danaus* came into *Greece*, to the Taking of *Troy*, 302 Years; *Troy* was therefore taken *Anno Mundi* 4386; and consequently in the 153^d Year of the 20th *Dynasty*.

11. That according to the same *Marbles*, *Cecrops* the first King of *Athens*, began to reign only 373 Years before *Troy* was taken; and consequently not till *Anno Mundi* 4013, and 181 Years after the *Exodus*.

12. That

12. That *Inachus* the first King of *Argos*, began to reign *Anno Mundi* 3700; and died *Anno Mundi* 3750. For, if we may depend upon *Castor's* Account, who reckons from the Beginning of his Reign to *Danaus* 384 Years; and subtract the same from the 4084th Year of the World, in which *Danaus* fled from his Brother *Ægyptus*, it will carry us back to the 3700th Year of the World, when *Inachus* began to reign; to which, if we add a Reign of 50 Years; it follows that he died *Anno Mundi* 3750, within 2 Years of the Birth of *Moses*. And if from the Year of the World 4386 in which *Troy* was taken, we deduct 3700 Years; it will likewise follow that *Inachus* began to reign at *Argos* 686 Years, or in round Numbers, about 700 Years before the Destruction of that City; and consequently that *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tatian* and *Africanus*, who made *Moses* and *Inachus* Cotemporary, and who also reckoned 700 Years from *Inachus* to the Destruction of *Troy*, were not so much out in their Reckoning, as *Eusebius* and others (24) have imagined. But the Truth is; all the Christian Writers, who make *Inachus* and *Moses* Cotemporary; seem to have been
 misled

(25) Primus omnium *Eusebius* conatus est ostendere Exodum Hæbræorum plusquam Annos 340 initio *Inachi* posteriorem esse, Scaliger in Animadvers. in Chronol. Euseb. Pag. 1.

misled by *Josephus* (25); who makes the *Shepherds* and the *Israelites* to be one and the same People. For, upon that Scheme, it would indeed follow, that *Inachus* began to reign at *Argos*, about 9 Years after the *Exodus*; and consequently that the first 31 Years of his Reign, was concurrent with the last 31 Years of *Moses* in the Wilderness.

13. That

(25) The Learned have hitherto found it so difficult to settle this Point, for want of knowing the true Order, Succession and Duration of the Egyptian Dynasties, that we see them to this Day greatly divided, and, as I may say, fighting in the Dark about it. The Learned *Marsham* rightly maintains that the *Shepherds* and the *Israelites* were two different and distinct People. Nos vero, says he, *Rationes multæ, neque minimi momenti, a Josephi sententia discedere cogunt. Israelitæ vixerunt numero 70; Pastores autem 240,000. Israelitæ manserunt in Gbosen; Pastores diripuerunt Memphim. Israelitæ redierunt post annos 215; Pastores non nisi post annos 511. Israelitæ miserâ servitute oppressi sunt; Pastores imperium exercuerunt in Egyptios. Chron. Can. p. 100, 101. And he rightly observes elsewhere (p. 105.) that the new King that first oppressed the *Israelites*, was of another Family from those they had lived under to that time; Rex novus ille, says he, τοῖς LXX, & S. Lucæ dicitur βασιλεὺς ἄλλος, Rex alius, id est, alienus. Sic Dii novi sunt alii, alieni. In eum sensum paraphrasi Josephi historici: τῆς βασιλείας δὲ ἄλλου ἄνθρωπος μετεβλήθη, Regno demigrante in aliam familiam; in aliam Domum; imo in aliam Gentem. But then he falls into gross Mistakes in asserting, (p. 104.) that the *Israelites* began to be oppressed, vivente adhuc Josepho; that the new King that first oppressed them, was *Salatis* the first Prince of the *Tanites*; and that the Original Egyptians were those Enemies, with whom the new King was afraid they would join. Secundum canonem nostrum, says he, Rex novus est Tanitarum primus, Salatis nomine. Inimici autem, quorum partibus Israelitæ accedere poterant, sunt Egyptii veteres, cum quibus Israelitæ diu amici vixerant, & Thebani, qui bellum tandem Pastoribus intulerunt. Chron. Can. p. 105. The very Reverse of which is the Truth of the Matter, as has been observed before. On the other hand, the learned *Perizonius*, who has taken *Marsham*'s System to pieces, sides with *Josephus*; and maintains that the *Israelites* and the *Shepherds* were one and the same People. But like most other Disputants, he is happier in overthrowing some parts of his Adversary's Hypothesis, than in establishing his own. See his Origin. Egypt. pag. 343—354.*

13. That the Method of Reckoning by *Olympiads*, according to the *Varronian* Account, began 342 Years after the Taking of *Troy*. For, if with *Petavius*, we suppose the first Year of the 194th *Olympiad* to be concurrent with the 750th Year of *Rome*; it will then follow that the first Year of the first *Olympiad* was concurrent with the 4728th Year of the World; from which if we take the Year of the World 4386, when *Troy* was taken, there will remain from the taking of *Troy* to the first *Olympiad* 342 Years. The learned Editor of the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, in his *Chronological Canon* ⁽²⁶⁾, makes this Interval to amount unto 434 Years; but it ought to be observed that he has no Authority for so doing, from the Marbles themselves.

14. That *Ogyges* was Cotemporary with *Inachus*: For, according to *Hellanicus*, *Philochorus*, *Castor*, *Thallus* and *Alexander Polybistor* ⁽²⁷⁾, he flourished about 1020 Years before the first *Olympiad*; and consequently about the Year of the World 3708: Not about the time of the Departure of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*; but about 17 Years after the *Expulsion* of the *Shepherds*. And this agrees with the Accounts of the *Athenians* themselves ⁽²⁸⁾, who made him Cotemporary with *Phoroneus* the Son of *Inachus*: For he might well survive the latter many Years. If

(26) P. 245. Edit. Ox. 1676.

(27) African. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 10. c. 10. pag. 484.

(28) Tatian apud Euseb. l. 10. c. 11. p. 494.

If the Principles here laid down wanted any further Confirmation, I might add,

15. That according to another List of the Kings of *Egypt* preserved by *Syncellus*; it appears that they had an Account of 86 Kings; whereof *Meftraim* was the *first*, and *Amasis* the *last*; who reigned in all about 2237 Years. Now *Meftraim* is plainly *Mizraim*, that Son of *Ham*, who was one of the Heads of the Builders at *Babylon*, *Anno Mundi* 2750; or *Anno post Diluvium* 494. And therefore if with the *old Chronicle*, we count from that Year to *Menes* 206 Years, from *Menes* to the first Year of *Cyrus* 2010 Years as before; and from the *first* Year of *Cyrus* to the *third* Year of *Cambyfes*, about which time *Amasis* died, 12 Years; the Sum total will amount unto 2228 Years; which differs from the Sum of the Reigns of the 86 Kings in the said List only about 9 Years; which may very well be ascribed to a Mistake in the Years of the Reign of some one or other of the said 86 Kings.

16. That according to *Syncellus*, the first of the *Pharaob's* mentioned in *Scripture* (29), and who reigned in *Egypt* when *Abraham* went down thither on Account of the Famine in the Land of *Canaan*; was called *Rameffamenos*; and according to the List was the 22^d from *Meftraim*. Now *Abraham* was called *Anno*

K 2

Mundi

(29) Gen. ch. xii. v. 10. 20.

Mundi 3403 ; and soon after he went down into *Egypt* on account of the said *Famine*. And according to the same List, *Rameffamenos* died about 641 Years after *Mestraim* began to reign ; that is *Anno Mundi* 3390 ; and the Difference between both Accounts amounts only to about 12 or 13 Years at most. But if we may suppose that *Rameffes* the next King in the same List, might also be called *Rameffameno* ; the Tradition and the List will then agree exactly.

17. That *Sousakeim* the 62^d King in the same List from *Mestraim*, is the self same Person with that *Sesac* or *Sbisbak* (or as the LXX and *Josephus* write his Name Σωσακη Σωσακμος (30)) who came up against *Jerusalem* in the 5th Year of *Reboboam*, For from the beginning of the Reign of *Mestraim* to the Death of *Sousakim* ; the List, supposing with *Scaliger* that *Chamois* the 14th King reigned 26 Years ; and that *Certos* the 31st King reigned 44 Years, reckons about 1763 Years : and on the other hand from the Year of the World 2749, the LXX and *Josephus* reckon to the 5th Year of *Rebo-*

(30) Monfr. *Des Vignoles*, Chron. de l'Hist. Sainte Tom. 2. l. 4. c. 3. §. 1. pag. 122. who could not at all relish this *Synchronism*, like a true modern Critic, that is without any other Authority save only his own *ipse dixit* ; roundly asserts that *Syn-cellus* forged the Name of this King ; D'ailleurs, says he, *Vénisphes* & *Susakim*, sont des noms que SYNCELLE a certainement SUPPOSEZ ici. le premier n'est dans aucune dynastie de ce tems, mais il est dans la première. Le Second est pris des LXX, & ne ressemble point à *Smendes* ou *Smendes*, dont il occupe la place.

Reboboam 1757 Years. So that *Sefac*, who according to the List reigned 34 Years, came up against and took *Jerusalem* in the 27th or 28th Year of his Reign.

Guided by these Principles, I have drawn up a SYNOPSIS of the *Egyptian Chronology*, both according to *Syncellus's* List of the Kings; and also according to the *old Egyptian Chronicle* and *Manetho's Dynasties*: The former containing the Space of 2237 Years; commencing *Anno Mundi* 2749, and ending about the third Year of *Cambyfes*, *Anno Mundi* 4986; and the latter containing the Space of 2198 Years, commencing *Anno Mundi* 2955, and ending about 15 Years before the Death of *Philip*, the Father of *Alexander the Great*, *Anno Mundi* 5153. And to the end that nothing may be wanting, I have likewise inserted the 38 *Theban* Kings of *Eratosthenes* in a column by themselves.

If I have by this means cleared up one of the most intricate and abstruse parts of *Ancient History*, to the Satisfaction of the learned Reader; he will easily be enabled by the Help of the annexed Tables, to point out many more *Synchronisms* in *Sacred* and *Profane* History, than I have mentioned here. But as there is some reason to think that several *Transpositions* and other Mistakes may have crept into *Syncellus's* List of the Kings, as well as into the first 15 *Dynasties* of *Manetho*; perhaps upon further Consideration,

on, some useful Remarks might be offered towards restoring both of them, if not altogether, yet still nearer to their primitive Order. But as that would require a larger Work; and more time than I can spare at present; I shall here conclude with a Word or two, by way of *Apolo-*
gy, for differing in so many Particulars, from *all* the *Learned* who have wrote before me upon this Subject, for almost *two thousand* Years past.

To whom are we beholden for our best *Sys-*
tems and greatest Improvements in *Chronology*? Is it not to *Africanus*? to *Eusebius*? to *Synce-*
lus? who having with indefatigable Pains and Industry consulted the best and most *Authentic*
Records of former Ages, have transmitted to us the *Substance* and *Quintessence* of them all. *He-*
rodotus and *Diodorus Siculus*, it must be own-
ed, are most excellent and valuable Historians. But who could ever have undertaken by their Help alone, to put the History of the first Ages of the World into any tolerable Order, without the Assistance of those *inestimable Treasures* which the others have so plentifully furnished us with? Are we then to subscribe implicitly to every thing that they have said or writ? No surely; that noble and generous Spirit, by which they were animated, could never entertain such a Thought. The Treasures which they had collected with so much Labour and Care, and
which

which they were so solicitous to preserve; were doubtless intended by them, not only for their own Use; but for the Benefit and Information of all Posterity. And therefore, granting the most that can be said in their disfavour; that they have not always made the best Use of those *Treasures* which they were Masters of; yet, to their *immortal Honour*, so much must be allowed; that without the Lights which they have so generously furnished us with; we could neither have discovered any of their Mistakes; nor yet pretended to offer any thing better of our own.

To whom are we beholden for the *Restoration* of *Chronology*; and for the present reigning Taste for all parts of History? Is it not to *Scaliger* and *Petavius*? to *Usser* and *Marsbam*? to *Vossius* and *Pezron*? who has gone farther or deeper in Researches of this nature than the great *Scaliger*? who has equalled the learned Jesuite in Diligence and Industry? Who can compare with the most Reverend *Archbishop* for Accuracy and Fidelity? or with the truly noble *Marsbam* for excellent and extensive Learning? Who can sufficiently admire the Courage and Resolution of *Vossius* and *Pezron*? who, like *Copernicus* and *Galilæo*, first ventured to restore the best and most ancient *System* of *Chronology*? But great and excellent and useful in their Kind as these *Writers* may be; yet I cannot but, in Justice to the Truth, own; that, in my poor Opinion;

on; they were mistaken in many things: And no Man, I hope, will imagine that by saying so, I mean to derogate in the least from their great *Worth* and *Merit*.

To conclude; after the Liberty that I have taken to Animadvert upon the Labours and Opinions of so many *great* and *excellent* Writers; and to differ from them in so many Particulars; I hope, the Reader will believe me, when I disclaim all Pretences to Infallibility myself. Possibly, I may be mistaken in many Things, as well as others: Possibly, I may have offered some Things which may stand the Test of the strictest Examination. Wherein I have failed; I shall with the greatest Pleasure submit to better Information. Wherein I have succeeded; let the *Praise* and *Honour* be given to *him* alone, to whom it is *only due*; to *him*, who is the *Way*, the *Truth* and the *Life*; to *him*, in whom all the *Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge* are hid; and who communicates his Gifts to the Sons of Men as he sees fit.

London, 23d December, 1749.

FINIS



d
g
r
e
l-
3
;
I
f.
s,
d
ne
l;
to
l-
m
is
in
a-
te